FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 040 28 February 1986

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Ambassador Mikhaylov Outlines MBFR Proposals AA 1
Zamyatin Calls U.S. Response to Gorbachev Proposal 'Lopsided' AA 2
Chernyshev on Possible Countermeasures to SDI AA 3
Zhukov Links Summit Meeting to Arms Talk Progress AA 4
[DPA]
Paper Anticipates U.S. Response to Soviet Proposals AA 5
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 22 Feb]
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on SDI as Barrier to Disarmament AA 7
[22 Feb]
Academic Examines Dangers of U.S. SDI Plans AA 9
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Feb]

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA Biotechnology Cooperation Commission Meets BB 1
[IZVESTIYA 27 Feb]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Korniyenko, Akhromeyev Hold News Conference CC 1
More on News Conference CC 1
'Top Priority' on Gorbachev Speech, U.S. Reaction CC 2
[Posner, Bogdanov, Plekhanov]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Reaction Continues to Reagan's Defense Appeal A 1
Kornilov Comments A 1
'Discontent' Growing in Congress [Mnatsakanov] A 2
'Gambler Psychology' Noted [Mnatsakanov] A 2
Zamyatin: USSR 'Ready' for Another Summit A 3
U.S. Policy Toward Philippines Considered A 3
Policy Hinges on Bases A 3
Aid Plan Under Review [Mnatsakanov] A 3
'Unceremonious' Interference [Zholkver] A 4
Ex-President Carter Criticizes SDI Program A 5
[IZVESTIYA 27 Feb]
Delay in Shuttle Launches 'Irritates' Pentagon A 5
[Borisenko]

SOUTH ASIA

USSR, DRA Exchange Messages on Treaty Anniversary D 1
Pakistani Pashtuns Forming Defense Committees D 1
Soviet Professor Discusses USSR-Iran Relations D 2

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Philippine Police Arrest 10 Conspirators E 1
Envoy to Thailand Interviewed on Bilateral Issues E 1
[Bangkok BANGKOK POST 20 Feb]

EASTERN EUROPE

Jaruzelski Discusses 'Solidarity', Foreign Debt F 1
Jaruzelski Presents State Decoration to Gromyko F 1
Murakhovskiy Receives PPR Agriculture Minister F 1
[PRAVDA 25 Feb]

WESTERN EUROPE

Antonov Trial Proceedings Move Into Final Stage G 1
Swedish Paper Reviews Komissarov Baltic Article G 2
[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 20 Feb]
More U.S. Cruise Missiles Coming to UK Base G 3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

PRAVDA Reports on Disturbances in Cairo H 1
[Peresada, 27 Feb]
IZVESTIYA Cites King Husayn on Mideast Situation H 1
[Geyvandov, 9 Feb]
Commentator on Kuwait National Day, Ties With USSR H 4
[Yuriyev]
Soviet-Tunisian Cooperation Body Signs Protocol H 5
[IZVESTIYA 27 Feb]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

IZVESTIYA Notes Chad Developments, Chides Habre [27 Feb] J 1
Offensive Planned J 1
'Interference' Condemned J 2

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Honduras To Investigate U.S. Chemical Spraying K 1
Nicaraguans Demonstrate Resolve Against U.S. K 1
[Trushin]
Further Reportage on Situation in Haiti K 1
Mass Demonstrations Reported [PRAVDA 27 Feb] K 1
'Tense Situation' Continues K 2

AMBASSADOR MIKHAYLOV OUTLINES MBFR PROPOSALS

LD272057 Moscow TASS in English 2049 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Vienna, February 27 TASS -- A full-delegation session of the states participating in the Vienna talks was addressed today by Ambassador Valeriyan Mikhaylov, the head of the USSR Delegation. He described the socialist countries' constructive steps outlined in their new draft "agreement on an initial cutback by the Soviet Union and the United States in land forces and armaments with a subsequent non-increase in the levels of the armed forces and armaments of the sides and related measures in Central Europe." These steps, he emphasized, cover, in essence, all the main areas of a possible accord: cutbacks in Soviet and U.S. troops, an obligation not to increase them, verification provisions, etc.

1. Taking into account the West's unpreparedness to go farther than that, we have agreed with reduced amounts of initial cutbacks in the troops of the USSR and the USA.

2. The West suggests cutting down Soviet and U.S. troops simply "part by part". We agree to that formula on the understanding that the units shall be from among combat troops and combat support troops.

3. The West suggests that information on concrete military units subject to cutbacks be given before an agreement is signed. We have no objections.

4. Our partners are for a freeze pledge to take effect immediately after Soviet-U.S. cutbacks are completed. We have no objections.

5. The West suggests a three-year freeze term. We agree to that.

6. Socialist countries are also ready to show flexibility with regard to the character of a freeze pledge. As is known, the West seeks the implementation of the pledge on a collective basis but limited to national sublevels of the troops of the USSR and the USA. We proceed from the premise that not only the USSR and the USA should contribute to a cutbacks and limitation agreement. All direct negotiators should make their contribution. At the same time, in the interests of reaching an accord, a possibility of applying full collectivity for both sides without any national sublevels could be considered.

7. The draft agreement submitted by socialist countries envisages an exchange of information with a view to specifying data on troops which fall under the action of a non-increase pledge, and annual renewals of the data according to the parameters which were already applied at the talks earlier.

8. In order to rule out the emergence of new troop contingents in the outback area in excess of the frozen levels, as well as in order to clarify some other contentious situations connected with the fulfillment of obligations under the agreement, provision is made for an on-site inspection at a well-founded request.

9. In addition to the above-mentioned verification measures, socialist countries have agreed to the establishment of permanent verification stations to monitor the entry and withdrawal of troops into and from the cutback area throughout the period of the currency of the agreement.

10. The draft agreement includes a provision for the setting up of a consultative commission and for its functions for the period of the currency of the agreement.

11. The West has expressed concern that difficulties as regards control over the dynamics of troop levels in the area of Central Europe may arise in the period of the action of the non-increase pledge, and that national technical verification means will be inadequate in this connection.

As for an increase in national troops resultant of a call-up of reservists, we are introducing a separate clause envisaging preliminary notification about a call-up of reservists. We also provide for mutual notifications about movements of land forces to the cutback area, inside it and from it, just as a notification about military exercises of land forces.

12. The concluding provisions of the draft agreement take into account the wishes of the Western side about a procedure for the ratification of a possible agreement.

Thus, Valeryan Mikhaylov pointed out, the overall picture of the new elements which are present in our detailed draft agreement dated February 20, this year, indicates that the Warsaw-Treaty countries have made serious constructive efforts in the interests of achieving positive results in Vienna. We have also made compromise steps with regard to verification. Eight out of seventeen clauses of the draft agreement deal with verification.

The introduction of the draft agreement by socialist countries on February 20 substantially broadens the sphere of mutual understanding between the negotiating parties and furnishes a practical basis for the elaboration of a mutually acceptable agreement.

The head of the USSR delegation also said that attempts by the Western negotiators to return to the question of spreading verification measures beyond the agreed-upon area of Central Europe are arbitrary and unfounded. There is no such question in existence, and the delegations of socialist countries will not discuss it in any way.

ZAMYATIN CALLS U.S. RESPONSE TO GORBACHEV PROPOSAL 'LOPSIDED'

LD281008 Moscow TASS in English 0956 GMT 28 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 28 TASS -- Getting acquainted with two recent statements made by President Reagan, one can say that the U.S. response to the Soviet proposals is not constructive, said Leonid Zamyatin, head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee. He spoke in the press center of the 27th Congress of the CPSU today. It is lop-sided in character and actually moves in a direction that is diametrically opposite to the provisions formulated in the January 15 statement of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The American response fails to offer a solution to the principled issue of preventing an arms race in outer space. The U.S. "star wars" program is announced inviolable.

As to the strategic arms, the old American proposal is re-stated -- something on which the Soviet Union had already commented. If that proposal was realized, the United States would get a more than two-fold superiority in nuclear warheads. In that case the U.S.S.R. would have to scrap its strategic nuclear forces and build them according to the American pattern.

On medium-range missiles, Leonid Zamyatin went on to say, we are offered the so-called zero option which the Soviet Union rejected earlier because it would enable the United States to retain what it would like to retain. The United States has officially stated its negative position on a nuclear weapon test ban. It is equally difficult to detect in the American response at least a fraction of constructiveness on chemical weapons, just as on the Vienna talks and the Stockholm conference. The question of security, moreover, is linked at will with regional conflicts and other problems that have no bearing on that question.

The U.S. response, added Georgiy Korniyenko, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., fails to advance the talks in Geneva by a single step.

CHERNYSHEV ON POSSIBLE COUNTERMEASURES TO SDI

LD272021 Moscow TASS in English 1907 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 27 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev

Certain persons in Washington are disturbed by the CPSU's impressive plans for speedy development of the USSR and consolidation of peace on earth. So they make a recourse to anachronisms in an effort to play down the importance and attractiveness of the Soviet policy and at the same time to justify somehow the United States militaristic course dangerous for the whole world. Thus, U.S. Congressman Robert Dornan just said in Washington that the Russians know that they cannot keep up with countries of the free world in technological competition so they come out against the SDI.

The most egoistic groups of the U.S. ruling class linked with the military-industrial complex still cherish the illusion that there emerged an opportunity to outstrip the USSR, to press on it by creating a "superweapon" for outer space and thus ensuring strategic superiority. They are blinded with the bellicose philosophy of "who is the first in space will rule the earth".

The authors of such futile fantasies, idle dreams forget the lessons of history, forget with whom they are dealing now, for the Soviet Union has long since become a great scientific and technological power. This has enabled the USSR to hold out and win the Second World War, to blaze the trail into space and to launch space exploration on a large scale, to ensure reliable defence.

They deliberately ignore the fact that every new step of the USA in the qualitative build-up of armaments was immediately countered by the USSR with adequate measures and that any "technological advantages" on which Washington counted thus disappeared as a rule. Meanwhile, the situation in the world was becoming less stable as a result, ever more arms appeared in the world. As Robert McNamara and Hans Bethe wrote, literally all technical initiatives in the sphere of the nuclear arms race came from the United States, but their net result has been the gradual undermining of U.S. security.

This will also be the case if the U.S. "star wars" programme is implemented. But that programme will entail grave consequences for all peoples, will put an end to any restriction of the arms race, give an impetus to this arms race in all directions, replacing a relative stability with strategic chaos. The intention to place arms in space is extremely dangerous for all peoples, including the American people.

As to the "technological competition" in that "star race", the calculations of "star warriors" are based on obvious delusion. If common sense fails to prevail in Washington and the SDI is made "irreversible", the Soviet Union will take counter-measures to restore the status quo, the way it happened many times in the past. It will not remain idle. The following basic principles will be taken into consideration in deciding on counter-measures:

First, these measures might be taken in the sphere of defensive arms, or offensive arms. The reply measures must not necessarily be taken in the same sphere, they just must be effective. The USSR will choose methods of counter-measures that will suit the most the interests of its defence capability.

Second, the USSR will not allow the United States to get the monopoly in outer space. It is simply not serious to hope for that.

Third, the Soviet Union will not be reducing its strategic potential which would be tantamount to helping the United States to weaken it. Quite the contrary, in order to restore the balance it will have to enhance the effectivity, precision and striking power of its armaments so as to neutralise, if need be, the electronic "star wars" machine being created by the USA.

Fourth, in any case the Soviet counter-measures will be adquate to the threat posed to the Soviet Union and its allies.

The analysis made by competent Soviet organisations and scientists showed that the USSR's counter-measures will be effective, less costly and can be effected within a shorter period of time. Washington strategists should recall the lesson of history: the creation by the Soviet Union of inter-continental ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear weapons to any point in the United States territory. Those who now intend to dictate their will to the world will be unable to sit it out beyond a space "shield", either. The USSR declares firmly and consistently against placing weapons in space. But this does not stem from weakness or fear of the U.S. SDI, the way certain persons in Washington try to claim. The Soviet Union is guided by political wisdom that is so necessary in the nuclear space age, by the interests of consolidating universal security, removing the fear of nuclear catastrophe, preserving civilisation on earth.

ZHUKOV LINKS SUMMIT MEETING TO ARMS TALK PROGRESS

LD211931 Hamburg DPA in German 1636 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, Feb (DPA) -- A positive reply from the Federal Republic to the ideas contained in the latest Soviet offers regarding the removal of all nuclear weapons by the year 2000 will "contribute to a warming of our two states' relations." This was stated by Soviet Peace Committee Chairman Yuriy Zhukov in Moscow on Friday. He stressed that the most important question in Moscow-Bonn relations is the security question. "And there is a broad field for accommodation, for a normalization of relations between our states." The lack of mutual understanding on these questions cannot be compensated for by solving other problems.

Regarding the subject of medium-range missiles in Europe, Zhukov said this problem can now be solved immediately. It is linked "to no conditions." The Federal Republic can and must say its word on the subject because "some of the missiles are on its territory and others are aimed at its territory."

"For some reason," Zhukov went on to say, "an increased interest in space weapons is now being shown in the Federal Republic." He was not even speaking of participation in the development of the "United States' star wars program." Defense Minister Manfred Woerner is now presenting a new plan for a "Euro-SDI." This cannot be linked with Mikhail Gorbachev's disarmament ideas.

Regarding Soviet-U.S. relations, Zhukov noted that it is "possible and necessary" to solve a series of problems prior to the next Gorbachev-Reagan summit. The question must be put: "What results can and must be achieved before the meeting and not as an outcome of the meeting?" He regarded it as possible for some of the practical questions contained in the November Geneva summit communique to be solved.

Zhukov said that according to this document, the arms control negotiations in Geneva, whose aim is formulated in the Soviet-U.S. foreign ministers' agreement of 9 January 1985, are to be accelerated. The aim is to prevent a militarization of space and to reduce nuclear armaments. "It is, therefore, clearly necessary for some progress to be achieved on this path prior to the meeting." There is no point in "continuing to repeat the same thing" at a summit.

Zhukov named the areas of nuclear tests, medium-range missiles, and chemical weapons. It will not be possible to achieve success in all questions by the time of the Washington meeting, "but it is possible and necessary in some of these questions." In the event that Washington has the political will "to normalize" relations with Moscow "and to stop the mad arms race," there will be such a possibility.

PAPER ANTICIPATES U.S. RESPONSE TO SOVIET PROPOSALS

PM241425 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 22 Feb 86 p 3

[Article by Vladlen Kuznetsov under the rubric "Look at Events": "The World is Looking at Moscow"]

[Excerpt] Moscow is far from the idea of using the augmentation of its economic potential to pursue a "from a position of strength" policy, as is the custom in some states whose leaders gamble on the primacy of force, and military force at that, considering it to be the very foundation of policy and diplomacy. A socialist state has different political priorities. And different concepts and ideas of factors like economic might and military strength. Economic might serves to satisfy the fundamental requirements of the people and to ensure conditions of peace for them and the country's security. The USSR's growing economic might will never be placed on the side of war on the scales of war and peace. It will be placed on the side of peace.

"We are dealing with our most serious adversary in our entire history. It is particularly difficult for us because the language this adversary speaks is the language of peace." That is how M. Kampelman, the leader of the U.S. delegation at the talks now under way in Geneva, perhaps the most important talks in the history of mutual relations between the world's mightiest powers, responded to the USSR, because it is an adversary talks must be conducted with it "from a position of strength." That means it is necessary to seek to achieve one-sided advantages.

That means it is necessary to seek military advantage over it. But what if you look at the USSR not as an adversary but as a partner in resolving common problems? After all security, arms reduction, and the easing of the burden of military appropriations are no less necessary to America than they are to the USSR. It is obviously only whose disinclined to seek a common language of peace with it who find it difficult to deal with the Soviet Union.

People throughout the world are now waiting to see how Washington will respond to the Soviet program for liberating the world from nuclear weapons in the next 15 years. They are waiting because they realize the importance of whether the USSR and the United States proceed in one direction -- toward a nuclear-free world -- or whether their paths diverge. The Soviet Union is in no hurry, realizing that it is not a simple question for Washington, that it will be more complex for it to resolve to do what the Soviet Union has resolved to do. Time is pressing. Time is pressing because every day of the arms race is a day lost to the world, a day which merely brings it closely to the nuclear abyss.

A reply is being born with difficulty, with pain, in the White House. People there evidently understand that this time they can no longer get away with high-flown declarations about their dream of living to see the time when nuclear weapons will disappear. It is reported that the president has already analyzed a number of possible options. But so far there is no one option which is the one which will be given. They say that before sending a reply to Moscow Washington has decided to seek the advice and support of their allies and other countries. Its emissaries have visited West Europe, Japan, and China. But it looks as though the U.S. representatives have not been listening to and soliciting advice so much as themselves trying to influence moods among the ruling circles of other states. Disseminating scepticism with regard to the Soviet disarmament plan and presenting it as illusory and offering one one-sided advantages to the Soviet Union, they have made it clear what reaction the White House would like.

At the same time all kinds of "leaks" are being organized from Washington which are supposed to serve as some kind of crib in assessing Soviet initiatives. The USSR's comprehensive program is being divided and separated into parts. On virtually every point dirty tricks, concealed motives, a false bottom, and so forth are being sought. They are discovering, as has already been the custom in the West in preparing answers to Soviet proposals, "a number of constructive elements" but are putting forward so many captious objections and reservations and demanding so many explanations that it will perhaps be impossible to deal with them before 2000..."

But why all this? Because they have been faced with the need to respond honestly and unevasively to the main question put by the Soviet Union: is the West prepared to part with nuclear weapons, not verbally, but in deeds? Do people there really want to make nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete" as the U.S. President proclaims, or is this nothing but a declaration designed to conceal the sinister aims of the "star wars" program?

To hear some opponents of the Soviet nuclear disarmament program, you would think Moscow had threatened the "holy of holies" of the Western world and its NATO alliance -- the "nuclear deterrence" ["sderzhivaniye"], without which the West will allegedly have a bad time of it. Without it, it is claimed, the entire peace which has been successfully maintained for these 40 years and more only thanks to the fear of retribution will collapse. If there are no nuclear weapons there will be no deterrent and no peace either. That is the logic to which we are advised to adhere. But what kind of logic is it? The logic of the perpetuation of the arms race.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA ON SDI AS BARRIER TO DISARMAMENT

PM241150 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[G. Kuznetsov article under the rubric "Reading the Lines of the Statement": "Fundamental Condition"]

[Text] As is known, the draft new edition of the party program is being submitted for discussion at the 27th CPSU Congress. It emphasizes that, regarding general and complete disarmament under strict, all-embracing international control [kontrol] as a historic task, the CPSU will consistently strive to limit and narrow the sphere of war preparations, particularly those connected with weapons of mass destruction. Above all, space should be totally excluded from this sphere, so that it does not become an arena of military rivalry or a source of death and destruction.

The comprehensive program of large-scale foreign policy actions set forth in the statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is a vivid example of the desire of the Land of the Soviets to realize these goals. The primary goal, starting in 1986 -- International Peace Year -- is to implement and complete over the next 15 years, before the end of the present century, the process of freeing the earth from nuclear weapons and freeing mankind from fear of a nuclear catastrophe. During the first stage, designed to last 5-8 years, the USSR and the United States halve the nuclear arms capable of reaching each other's territory. "It goes without saying," the statement emphasizes, "that such a reduction is only possible if the USSR and the United States mutually renounce the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike arms." It is proposed that at the second stage the accord banning space strike arms will become a multilateral accord, with obligatory participation by the leading industrial powers. This stand of the UN General Assembly resolution on the peaceful use of space was adopted by 151 votes (with 1 abstention -- the United States).

"Moving toward a nuclear-free world, mankind is obliged to surmount the obstacles which might arise on this path. And chief among the obstacles of this kind are attempts to militarize space and to saturate near-earth space with space strike weapons, turning it into a military bridgehead. The realization of the 'star wars' concept will cancel out hopes of reducing nuclear arms on earth -- everyone must realize this," M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in his message to the mayors of the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which were the first victims of American atom bombing.

Why is the question of "star wars," disguised as the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), raised so categorically? Official Washington calls SDI "highly moral" and "exclusively defensive," since it is said to be designed to destroy weapons, not people, and is called upon to render nuclear ballistic missiles "obsolete and unnecessary." But all these stilted expressions are nothing but exceptionally dangerous deception meant for naive simpletons. And this is realized by many people, although far from all, in the United States.

This is what P. Warnke, former head of the U.S. delegation at the SALT talks, says, for example: "A security system based on the principle of nuclear deterrence and strategic parity between the USSR and the United States has taken shape over recent decades. The realization of SDI will upset it and lead to an immediate rise in the level of military confrontation between the two powers."

The approximate Soviet-U.S. strategic parity is socialism's historic achievement, for it has a deterrent effect on the forces of aggression and militarism. Two treaties -- SALT II and that on the limitation of ABM systems -- are aimed at preserving this parity (and this was admitted recently by Admiral Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff). The latter treaty is frequently called the most important of all agreements concluded in the arms limitation sphere between the USSR and the United States.

The work now being done in the United States under the SDI program with a view to creating [sozdaniye] a "space shield" is fraught with the undermining of the ABM Treaty. This means that R. Reagan's administration is deliberately trying to upset strategic parity and secure military superiority over the USSR with the help of space systems. P. Warnke calls this policy "fundamentally wrong, since it does not take the Soviet Union's security interests into account." It is noteworthy that six former U.S. defense secretaries come out in support of preserving the ABM Treaty -- McNamara, Clifford, Laird, Richardson, Schlesinger, and Brown.

The implementation of the "star wars" program would mean that the Soviet-U.S. talks now under way would be wrecked and all existing arms limitation agreements would be nullified. It is obvious to all sober-minded people that a situation of an absolutely uncontrolled arms race is strategic chaos. If President R. Reagan, Representatives C. Studds stated, "does not compromise over 'star wars,' arms control will never get moving and the blame for that failure will lie with the United States."

Planning to launch many units of strike weapons into space, Washington claims that they will have one function -- defense against Soviet ICBM's. Even in the United States many people see this as camouflage for the Pentagon's real plans. Political analyst R. English, who used to work in the Pentagon, reports in an article published in the NEW REPUBLIC magazine that the calculations made by the military research firm (Argonne) National Laboratory show that orbiting lasers are capable of destroying targets on earth. The spread of the arms race to space, English stresses, is fraught with highly dangerous consequences, as the Soviet leadership warns.

How is it possible to speak of the "defensive" aims of SDI when a space-arms sword of Damocles will hang over mankind? And might not the creation of a "space shield" engender an illusion of impunity creating a temptation to carry out a first nuclear strike from behind the "shield," thus preventing or at least weakening the retaliatory strike? And that is not a hypothetical question. At a closed symposium held quite recently in Washington J. Gardner, director of a Strategic Defense Initiative Organization department, frankly admitted that its implementation will "sharply change the nuclear balance in the United States' favor." According to the nuclear war "scenario" that he outlined, THE BOSTON GLOBE noted, the possession of an ABM system with space-based elements would permit the United States even after a "bilateral nuclear exchange" to reserve the strike capability [undarnyy kulak] of its strategic offensive forces.

Thus proponents of "star wars" themselves clearly refute the propaganda claims about their willingness to make missile weapons "obsolete and unnecessary." Incidentally, these are also refuted by the entire practice of Washington's acceleration of the race in offensive arms. Space systems are being planned and created not as replacements but as supplements for offensive strategic first-strike weapons. "While laying great stress and emphasis on defensive systems," Pentagon Chief C. Weinberger stated, "we are not only not abandoning offensive nuclear deterrent forces but are strengthening and modernizing them."

Requesting $311.6 billion for fiscal 1987, the Pentagon plans to allocate $4.8 billion for work on the implementation of SDI and $25.4 billion for strategic arms (not counting spending on research and development). "The United States is now starting to act from a position of strength, which promises to increase our might in relation to the enemy," Weinberger boasts. "We must convince the Russians that this is not a short-term phenomenon."

It is necessary to "convince the Russians" -- the long-term U.S. plans for an arms buildup are no secret to us. Nor should it be a secret to anyone that no talks "from a position of strength" with our state will take place. Thus, as the saying goes, they are wide of the mark. The USSR will never allow anyone to gain military superiority over it. "Our material and intellectual potential makes it possible for the Soviet Union to create any weapons if we are forced to," M.S. Gorbachev's statement says. But we fully realize our responsibility to present and future generations. It is our profound conviction that it is necessary to enter the 3d millennium not with the 'star wars' program but with large-scale plans for peaceful space exploration through the efforts of all mankind."

The SDI is the means whereby U.S. imperialism would like to turn space into the military bridgehead necessary, in the Pentagon strategists' opinion, in order to gain world domination. That is why the Soviet Union resolutely opposes the implementation of this sinister scheme. That is why a refusal to deploy strike arms in space is the key to resolving the problem of strategic arms reductions and the fundamental condition for those reductions.

ACADEMIC EXAMINES DANGERS OF U.S. SDI PLANS

PM261539 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Feb 86 Single Edition p 11

[Text] In the section devoted to the party's foreign policystrategy in the report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the words that it is vital to seek a real solution in order to guarantee that the arms race is not to be transferred to space sound like a warning bell.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA correspondents B. Artemov and A. Korobov asked Dr of Historical Sciences Richard Sergeyevich Ovinnikov, rector of the USSR Foreign Ministry Moscow State Institute of International Relations, to comment on this section of the political report:

In analyzing the foreign policy section of M.S. Gorbachev's report to the party congress and the part devoted to the "star wars" idea, let us remember the political backdrop against which this idea emerged. In the first few years after it came to power, the current U.S. administration did not consider it shameful to officially state that the United States had embarked on a massive rearmament program. As U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger put it, people overseas were prepared to "prevail" over the Soviet Union. Moreover, U.S. Vice President Bush once remarked that it is possible to win a nuclear war if well prepared for it. And in this specific respect "SDI" was seen as a decisive means of achieving global strategic supremacy.

Wherein lies the specific danger of "SDI"? I would note the following aspects. First, the very emergence of the "star wars" idea brings to mind an attempt to cover up the expedited development of U.S. offensive arms in all avenues with a smoke screen. Approximately a month before "SDI" was announced the Joint Chiefs met with the U.S. President. The meeting sought ways of justifying to Congress the new appropriations for various military programs, primarily the MX program. They then came to the conclusion that this would be promoted by positing some idea which would cover up the new military programs in a rosy defensive glow. The operation was dubbed "MX plus" -- that is, an operation to push the appropriations for the MX program through Congress.

Aspect two. As they say in Washington, the first phase of "SDI" development poses no threat since the United States cannot launch an attack if its own defensive system has not yet been perfected, and that, they claim, is why they are incapable of defending themselves. A good answer to this was given by Robert McNamara, the well-known U.S. figure, who stated that, of course, a leaky umbrella gives no protection from a shower, but it may be a help in a drizzle. He meant by this that an incomplete "SDI" system cannot provide cover against the first strike -- which the United States is not threatened by, incidentally -- but it may be useful for inflicting a first strike against against the USSR and then providing cover against a weakened retaliatory strike.

Such an approach is irresponsible primarily in relation to the American people themselves. U.S. political scientists cynically state that some casualties on the U.S. side are inevitable, but justified. Those who contemplate using SDI at the first stage of its deployment proceed from the concept of "acceptable losses." The fact that between 20 to 50 million Americans would perish in this respect does not concern them: as long as socialism is erased from the face of the earth.

In justifying the full deployment of the SDI system, it is usually claimed that this system is of a defensive nature and envigates, they say, carrying out strikes only Soviet missiles in flight. But many American specialists attest to the fact that the use of a deployed SDI system is planned to attempt to destroy Soviet missiles in their silos before they are launched -- that is, as first strike weapons.

One of the most dangerous aspects of SDI is destabilization of the international situation. If the arms race moves into space, strategic stability in the world will be totally destroyed. What is more, this will signify the crossing of that fateful line, when the slide toward a thermonuclear war will be irreversible.

And there is another aspect -- the technical aspect. Primarily American scientists themselves cannot see sufficient theoretical and purely practical potential that would make it possible to build an SDI system. As a whole, SDI is a very risky game by adventurist U.S. circles, a game not only with the destiny of tens and hundreds of millions of people, but also with the fate of mankind as a whole. That is why it is natural for criticism of SDI to be given due attention in the report by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev.

CEMA BIOTECHNOLOGY COOPERATION COMMISSION MEETS

PM271628 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 8

[TASS report: "CEMA Commission Session"]

[Text] The first session of the CEMA Standing Commission on Cooperation in the Sphere of Biotechnology was held in Moscow 24-26 February. Taking part in it were delegations from the CEMA countries: Bulgaria, Hungary, the SRV, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and the CSSR.

On the basis of the tasks defined by the CEMA session at its 41st (extraordinary) sitting, the commission prepared draft regulations for the standing commission for presentation to the CEMA Executive Committee that define the standing commission's objectives, main tasks, functions, and powers aimed at further developing multilateral economic, scientific, and technical cooperation among the CEMA countries in the sphere of biotechnology and at implementing the comprehensive program for the CEMA countries' scientific and technical progress up to the year 2000.

The commission will ensure the coordination and organization of the work to resolve the most important intersector problems of multilateral cooperation in the sphere of the development of biotechnology, encompassing the implementation of fundamental research, including genetic engineering, the development and creation of biotechnological production facilities, and the necessary laboratory and industrial equipment for this task. The introduction of the achievements of biotechnology into the national economies of the CEMA countries will promote the growth of the population's prosperity, the improvement of its health, and the fuller satisfaction of its needs, and ensure the protection of the environment.

The session prepared a draft general agreement on multilateral cooperation in the biotechnology sphere and ratified the plan for the commission's work in 1986-1987.

The commission session was held in an atmosphere of friendship, mutual understanding, and comradely cooperation.

KORNIYENKO, AKHROMEYEV HOLD NEWS CONFERENCE

LD280821 Moscow TASS in English 0813 GMT 28 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 28 TASS -- "The Soviet program for ensuring peace and security" is the subject of a news conference that opened in the press center of the 27th Congress of the CPSU. The speakers at the news conference are: Georgiy Korniyenko, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the U.S.S.R., Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces and first deputy minister of defense of the U.S.S.R., and Leonid Zamyatin, head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee.

Matters related to the foreign policy activities of the Communist Party and the Soviet state are dealt with in detail in the political report given to the congress by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, as well as during the discussion of the report. The cornerstone of these activities, it was stressed at the news conference, is the provision made by V.I. Lenin and reiterated in the new edition of the CPSU Program that the historical dispute between the two opposing systems into which the world is divided can and should be resolved by means of peaceful competition, and not by military means.

More on News Conference

LD280852 Moscow TASS in English 0845 GMT 28 Feb 86

[Excerpt] Accordingly, the chief aim of the foreign policy of the CPSU always was and remains to give the Soviet people the possibility to work in the conditions of lasting peace. However, it is not only the Soviet, but all other peoples as well, that need a lasting peace. Peace is an indispensable condition for social progress in general, and today it is even more than that -- it is a matter of human survival. Now that people have come to control means of self-destruction, the Soviet Union considers it a paramount task to stop material preparations for nuclear war, to turn around the arms race on earth and to prevent it from spreading into outer space, and to eliminate nuclear weapons totally and everywhere by the end of this century. Regrettably, the response which came the other day from the American side to the nuclear disarmament program proposed by the Soviet Union can in no way be considered constructive, as was pointed out at the congress. Conversely, it shows that the U.S. leadership intends to continue spurring on the arms race on earth and spreading it into outer space in a bid to secure military superiority.

The continuous escalation of the level of armed confrontation is by no means a way to peace, as President Reagan claims. If the arms arsenals keep swelling, even parity ensures at best equal danger rather than equal security. In the age of nuclear missiles the genuine security of states is only possible as security for all. Even in the past -- in the prewar period and after the war -- the Soviet Union gave preference to ideas of collective security but today, according to our profound conviction, it is not merely a preferential but the only possible way of ensuring lasting peace.

This explains why our party has raised the question of developing a comprehensive system of international security, the military, political, economic and humanitarian foundations of which are presented in the political report. These foundations could become a starting point and provide a framework for a direct and regular dialogue among the leaders of the countries of the world community, both bilateral and multilateral. The idea was also put forward in this context that the leaders of the five states, the permanent members of the Security Council, sit down to discuss what can be done to safeguard and strengthen peace.

'TOP PRIORITY' ON GORBACHEV SPEECH, U.S. REACTION

LD271638 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 27 Feb 86

["Weekly" discussion entitled "Top Priority" hosted by Vladimir Posner, with Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhnov of the United States and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, in a discussion of the political report delivered by Mikhail Gorbachev at the 27th CPSU Congress]

[Text] [Posner] Hello and welcome to "Top Priority." Today on the panel are Professor Radomir Bogdanov and Professor Sergey Plekhanov of the United States and Canada Studies Institute, and I am your host, Vladimir Posner. We go on the air today on day two of the 27th Party Congress, and obviously we will concentrate on the political report made by Mikhail Gorbachev, the general secretary, and in particular on the foreign-policy aspects of that report and those that deal with Soviet-U.S. relations.

One of the first reactions in the West to this report has been that it is extremely critical of the West and of the United States, and that it puts the blame for the difficult situation the world finds itself in on the West. And that the tone is very strict and stringent. What would you say to that?

[Bogdanov] You know, Vladimir, I cannot help but just to disagree with that point of view, because of my mind it's not fair at all. And I am really surprised how, without reading the full text, without studying it, literally speaking, with the pen, you can make such a, such a serious conclusion, that it is too harsh, too strong on the West. I cannot agree with that. You know, to be frank with you, Vladimir, I just concentrated my attention on foreign-policy part of that report, but to be frank with you I'm more interested in the domestic problems, which area lot of that report, but since I knew that we are going to meet with you, then of course naturally we concentrated with my friend Sergey on that. But you know, my first reaction is -- you'll be surprised; maybe our listeners over there will be surprised, too -- that it's really very balanced, very mild, and I would put it like that: It's very realistic, very realistic, in his observations on American foreign policy. I would put it like that: on this incumbent administration and on the policy of the West as a whole, you know.[as heard] And if the other side always says that they have now, since they are in power, a very realistic view of the Soviet Union, why we cannot have a very realistic view of this American Administration and USA policies. That's my point. The second point of mind is that it's very balanced in the sense that given our realistic assessment of this administration, with all the criticism that we have and all the grievances and worries about the policy of this administration, we'd rather concentrate on the positive side of this (?story). We suggest what should be done to improve, really drastically improve. And I believe that the main point of his is that there is objective conditions, mind you, objective conditions for improvement in the Soviet-American relations to such an extent that they can go to really cooperative and mutually beneficial relations between USA and USSR. And if we say that the danger is in the nuclear weapons, in the nuclear war, and the danger is still there and we believe that USA, that this administration is responsible for that, that's our view; and I think that we have a right to have a view. That's our view, you know, It's not [word indistinct] there is nothing outstanding in that.

[Posner] Let's take a look at what the general secretary had to say concerning the letter he had received from President Reagan, which would seem to be a response to the proposals that were made back on 15 January. In a general way I think it could be said that Mikhail Gorbachev was not fully pleased with that letter. What would you say, Professor Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] To put it mildly, he was not very pleased with it, because number one, the basic, you know, the letter contained the basic restatement of the previous American positions on the key issues of arms control and Soviet-American relations in this sphere. It is nice, of course, to see President Reagan restate that the United States is in favor of ridding the earth of nuclear weapons, but that's just a declaration. When it comes to the specific points, like: Why not stop the tests of nuclear weapons, why not eliminate medium-range weapons from Europe, why not foreclose the possibility of arms race moving into space, and the other topical issues -- on all those issues the position of the United States remains the same; and, well, Comrade Gorbachev emphasized that the clarification of the American response is not yet over. The specific details are being discussed and the American side in Geneva, I understand, is clarifying the American position, but at this point the general secretary emphasized that at this point, to the extent that he can judge on the American position, it is not encouraging and it reflects the old faults that existed in the American positions for quite some time.

[Posner] Yesterday one of the American political commentators, I believe it was on CBS, said that he was disappointed by what General Secretary Gorbachev had said in the field of international relations and Soviet-American relations, that specifically he had said nothing new, he had nothing new to say, concerning the Soviet proposal to achieve nuclear disarmament by the year 2000. What would you say to that? My personal reaction was that everything has more or less been said.

[Bogdanov] Yeah, that's my reaction, too, but at the same time, you know, I'm again surprised how serious people can talk in those terms, you know. Number two. Number one: I'm sorry. You have a comprehensive set of proposals. You have some comments -- I believe, very important comments -- on those proposals. For instance, the secretary general said that this is a Soviet, the Soviet program for many years to come. That we'll fight for that program not for this given figure, but for many years to come. What does it mean in practice? It means in practice that that will become a cornerstone -- I mean nuclear disarmament -- of the Soviet foreign policy, for the time being, to the end of this century. That's a very important statement, you know. And if you make, if you are really fair and impartial enough you will see the importance of that for the whole, you know, environment. Then the secretary general has given some specifics on that, you know, he commented on some specific parts of that problem and he called once again upon all the responsible, you know, centers of power in the West to just to look at those proposals, not as a propaganda ploy on the side of the Soviet Union, but as a businesslike program that we really throw on the table for discussion. And I believe if you followed the spirit and letter of his comments on that, you will see that it's a very, it's not a you know, closed program in the sense that that's the, that's the, our, last word and we are not open for some suggestions, discussion, and so on. So it's on the table and we should discuss it, but if you put it in this way: there is nothing new -- then of course there is nothing to discuss. That's the usual Western approach to our initiatives. But I believe the time is too dangerous and too crucial to go along those very used and old lines.

[Plekhanov] Besides, there is -- I would like to make another point. The program of nuclear disarmament was put forward just about a month ago. It's a huge, detailed, complex program. And it took the United States Government just 1 month to come with the initial response to it. So to expect our leadership to come up with another program like that after so short a time would really I think, put into question the seriousness of the first program. It is not done for just public-relations purposes. It's a serious, businesslike document, and a long-term plan. So I'm not really surprised that it was basically a restatement of the program [as heard] and the elaboration and the emphasis, doctrinal emphasis, and so on.

[Posner] Let's take a look at one point, and that is that the general secretary stated that to make the agreement on nonmilitarization of space more feasible, certain concrete results had to be reached in advance. And to make that possible, the Soviet Union was willing to negotiate the issue of medium-range missiles in Europe without in any way linking that to the negotiations on strategic weapons and on space-defense weapons. Now do you consider that to be an important measure? Do you think that it could be indeed conducive to agreement in these key areas?

[Bogdanov] You know, it is not only important measure, this is a very practical, very practical measure in the sense that it's within our reach. He has mentioned two things that are within our reach: He mentioned moratorium on nuclear tests, and European problem with INF, you know. So -- and he put it again very bluntly that we have separated INF from strategic and space weapons. That is, we have opened the way to the agreement. And you know, at the same time he has, briefly but I believe very substantially, he has analyzed President Reagan's answer to our proposal, pointing out that is is again unfair and unbalanced proposals. It is not exactly proposals, you know; it is some contradictions, some restrictions, some, you know, difficulties. For instance, the American side has been linking the abolition of new INF in Europe with the situation in Asian part. And you know, they are doing it, as secretary general put it, trying to just decrease our defense in that part. For they link it with conventional, you know, forces, but again they link it in such a way that we have to go along the way of unilateral conventional disarmament, which is not, of course, acceptable, you know, to us. And some other points, you know. But still we believe -- and he has, he has emphasized it -- that moratorium and INF problems, just, you can, you can strike an agreement on that.

[Posner] I would like to ask you what you think on -- or perhaps let me put it differently -- what the Americans, you are saying, is that they cannot dictate to Great Britain or to France in Europe and tell Great Britain and France to impose a ceiling to freeze or not to accept other kinds of medium-range missiles. Now is that, would you take that as a very serious reason to not accept the Soviet proposal?

[Plekhanov] No, I don't think that this is really a valid argument. It's just searching for escape clauses, for some escape hatches from the problem of nuclear disarmament in Europe. One should try. If the United States obstructs the movement towards making Europe free of nuclear weapons, then of course Britain and France -- especially Britain -- would be an obstacle; and besides, you know, our proposal does not really involve any cuts in British or French nuclear potentials. They -- at the initial stage of this program of nuclear disarmament, they can leave their forces at the given level, at the current level. What is required is that the United States and the Soviet Union remove all of their medium-range missiles from Europe.

[Posner] Yes, but...

[Plenkhanov continues] The only condition, the only condition is that Britain and France not increase their medium-range weapons.

[Posner] What the Americans are saying is that they cannot answer for the British and the French. Now how do we get around that one?

[Plekhanov] But we have proposed to discuss this program with the British and French Governments separately, and there hasn't been a flat rejection of such discussion from either side.

The important thing is that, that there should be willingness to address the program of this nuclear disarmament, that the ceilings of the existing weapons be brought down, not brought up. If I think there is a commitment to that goal on the Western side, then the details can be worked out.

[Bogdanov] And there is another very important point: The circumvention problem, you know. If USA takes an obligation that they would not circumvent the agreement by supplying strategic and INF means to Britain and France, then you will see how the picture will be different from what they are talking about.

[Posner] Yes, now let's go on to another point, and that is the summit. The general secretary very clearly said that for a summit to be possible between the United States and the Soviet Union, there has to be a good reason for it, there has to be a result. Some people are saying in the West that that was a signal that the Soviet Union does not want a summit. How do you feel about that?

[Plekhanov] Well, that's certainly a wrong interpretation. The Soviet Union has always been in favor of talking at the summit level on the issues of security and arms control, and Soviet-American relations and relations with other states; and in this particular setting, of course there is a great willingness to continue the summit process, the dialogue at the summit -- but to continue and to develop it, not just talk for the sake of talking. People in all countries, I think, are expecting progress from further summits. There can be only one summit at which you simply get to know each other and have some initial discussions, and I think it is legitimate to expect that the next summit should bring specific results in the areas where progress is possible. And progress is possible in the area of stopping the nuclear tests and concluding a treaty on banning nuclear tests, and secondly on the question of elimination of INF's from Europe, so it is just, I chink, that the statement by Comrade Gorbachev is, should be interpreted as a way of making the summit agenda more specific and inviting the Reagan administration to think about the specifics of the next summit, rather than simply, you know, sort of undermining the idea of a summit.

[Bogdanov] You know, let me state my own view on that -- and I believe maybe my view is not very conventional -- but I believe that without very clear statement from the American side that substantial agreement is possible, no summit to my mind is useful. Otherwise, it would be a fake summit, in the sense that under the cover of that meeting the Americans' side will go with the, proceed with the arms race, under the cover of that. And I don't understand why we should help them to do that. That's a very wrong thing.

[Plekhanov] That's right.

[Posner] Well, in conclusion, let's look at one final point that was made in the general secretary's political report, and which concerns a comprehensive system of international security and which includes the military area, the political area, the economic area, the humanitarian area. How do you, do you see this as a realistic idea, and how important do you think that whole view actually is for the world today?

[Plekhanov] Vladimir, I believe that this part of secretary's, of the secretary general's report, is so important that we should devote one of our Top Priorities especially for that (?program).

[Posner] Well, let's do it next here.

[Bogdanov] Because, yeah, you know, that's really very positive side of the whole, of the whole foreign-policy part of the report.

[Posner] Next time we will do that, but (?as sort of) briefly [word indistinct].

[Bogdanov] Yes, yes, briefly, briefly, you know, your question is how practical it is. I believe, it is very practical. Why is it very practical? First of all, it covers all the areas of disagreement between us and USA and between East and West. So in these basics -- it is called basics in the report -- the secretary general has accumulated the experience, you know, our mutual experience for, maybe, for the last decade or two decades. That's number one. Number two: It takes into consideration not only traditional areas of basics between East and West, you say in USSR like military, like political, [as heard] it takes into consideration human aspects of our relations based on our experience, you know, including the family, including human rights, and all that, you know. Then maybe for the first time it's very, it very seriously has been considering the economical aspects of the basics, because in the present environment, economic relations between East and West, between the so-called South and North, you know, become of overall importance, you know. If you keep in mind debt problem and all that, you know. So and my third point is that the solutions we suggest -- and I hope we will be talking about that next time -- are very realistic and very practical, and it's really what it is called in the, what is called in the report a new approach, a new thinking, in the foreign policy area, you know. That's why I believe that it is very practical, it is very important, and maybe one time, all of us -- I mean West, East, USA, USSR -- will come to discuss it very thoroughly and try to find out, if you like, legal, you know, expression of the basics on a mutual basis, something like that.

[Posner] Well thank you very much, Dr Bogdanov, Dr Plekhanov. I think we have our work cut out for us next time; we will be discussing this idea of international security, and until then this is Vladimir Posner saying goodbye on behalf of the team of "Top Priority," until next week.

REACTION CONTINUES TO REAGAN'S DEFENSE APPEAL

Kornilov Comments

LD272248 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1157 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, 27 Feb (TASS) -- TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov writes:

Calls for staking on force are again ringing out in Washington, and very dangerous statements about military confrontation and total confrontation are again being declaimed. "Strength is the most convincing argument," "The might of America is an inalienable element of peace", maintains the U.S. President in an address to the country only just released.

All this is not simply bellicose rhetoric. The thesis "strength is the most convincing argument," advanced by Washington, is continued to be substantiated at an accelerated rate by a giant material and technical militarist base. Although the U.S. nuclear arsenals are stuffed to the limit, certain U.S. circles are feverishly replenishing them with newer and newer weapons carrying destruction and death. The U.S. military budget for the next financial year will exceed $310 billion, a record sum in the country's history. Preparations for militarizing space are proceeding at full speed. More than $1 trillion -- this is the sum which has already been spent on the program of "modernization of U.S. military might," which envisages the creation of the armaments of a new generation, such as the first-strike ballistic missiles "MX", the "Trident" system, the siting of "Pershing-II" and cruise missiles on the territories of West European countries. Why, with what aim is this all being done?

Preparing for war is one of the most effective means to preserve peace, the President's message goes. This is not a new thesis, turning to examples of distant and not-so-distant history, one could easily show by facts just how deplorably ended the political careers of those who on the pretext of "concern for peace" gambled on the "big stick" policy in order to establish by force the state orders which would please and suit them, wherever possible.

But if strongarm devices and methods in politics brought no dividends to their initiators previously, these devices and methods are all the more inadmissible and unacceptable today, in the nuclear age, when such arsenals of nuclear weaponry have been accumulated in the world that, if it is set in motion, the destiny of all civilization would be jeopardized. The very nature of today's weapons deprives any state, including, of course, the United States, of the hope that if nuclear war breaks out it would manage to keep away from the abyss of nuclear self-immolation.

The modern world has become too small and fragile for wars and power politics. It is time that those who, adhering to long and forever outdated political postulates, stubbornly depict the "position of strength" as "America's trump card" came at last to realize the international realities of today. To realize that man has reached a turning point in his history, where he must make a choice about the remainder of his path -- either to overcome the inertia of a past in which security was regarded first and foremost through the prism of a position of strength and of military-technical solutions, or remain a hostage to the arms race -- nuclear, chemical, or, in the long-term, of some other kind, no less dangerous. The path of war will provide Washington with no sensible solutions -- international or domestic. It is impossible to save and preserve peace without breaking firmly and irrevocably with patterns of thought and behavior which for centuries have been built on continuity, and the permissibility of wars and armed conflict.

The U.S. President avers that, while delivering an apology for a policy of force, he is concerned about nothing other than his country's "security fence." But it is plain to all that in our nuclear age guaranteeing security is a political problem, which can be resolved only by political means. True, security cannot be built on doctrines of "terrorizing" others, on doctrines of encouraging an arms race which is capable, sooner or later, of getting out of control.

The fact that, by all appearances, not all the politicians in Washington realize these political axioms cannot but evoke concern. This concern is even more justified if one takes into consideration that the appeals to count on strength and on the arms race that go together with inventions about the non-existent "Soviet threat" and the "hand of Moscow" are coming from Washington today, when international relations are keynoted by the "spirit of Geneva" and when the U.S. ruling circles seem to have every opportunity to prove by concrete actions that their statements about U.S. allegiance to peace and arms control are not empty phrases.

One cannot fail to notice that the attempts to present force as the most convincing argument of Washington's foreign policy came only several days after the answer of President Reagan to the Soviet statement of January 15 -- the answer which hardly shows the readiness of the U.S. leaders to come to grips with the cardinal problems connected with the removal of the nuclear threat. In his address the U.S. President said that the U.S. wished to put an end to the state policy of intimidation, threats and the continuous striving for domination. This is what the Soviet and world public expect from U.S. foreign policy makers today.

'Discontent' Growing in Congress

OW271601 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 27 Feb 86

[From the "World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] Yesterday Reagan appeared on national television with a speech that presidential advisers themselves bluntly called an attempt to foist the military budget on the U.S. Congress and people. For the next fiscal year, the U.S. Government intends to spend over $311 billion for the arms race, which is almost 8.5 percent more than in the current fiscal year.

It appears that discontent with the administration's course is growing in the U.S. Congress. In particular it has been reported that after stormy and bitter debate, the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress adopted by a majority vote an important, I would even say a very important, resolution. The resolution urges the U.S. Government to immediately renew talks with the Soviet Union for the purpose of concluding an agreement on universal and total prohibition on nuclear weapon testing. The adoption of this resolution is quite a major defeat for the White House.

'Gambler Psychology' Noted

LD270047 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2040 GMT 27 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] I do not know whether it is an accidental coincidence or not, but right at this very moment, when an appeal to mankind's reason and conscience is to be heard from the rostrum of the CPSU Congress on behalf of ending the arms race, President Reagan in his speech on nationwide television has stated directly that his administration will not allow any cutbacks whatsoever in the arms race buildup, not now or in the future.

The so-called program for modernizing the U.S. military might has cost that country $1 trillion. The President has lavished praise in every possible way on this achievement of his, as he put it. Preparation for war, as he said, is one of the most effective means of preserving peace: strength is the most convincing argument we have. At the moment, as we sit at the negotiating table with the Soviet Union, we will not deprive America of this trump card.

As is evident, over the ocean there is no way they can, or want to, reject the gambler psychology. Touching on his beloved idea of "star wars," Reagan said directly that his administration already now is planning the creation [sozdaniye] without delay of a real system of space weapons.

ZAMYATIN: USSR 'READY' FOR ANOTHER SUMMIT

LD281041 Moscow TASS in English 1035 GMT 28 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 28 TASS -- The Soviet Union is ready for another Soviet-American summit, which, as Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said in the political report, would really be aimed at the practical solution of political questions rather than be a protocol occasion, Leonid Zamyatin, head of the Department of International Information of the CPSU Central Committee, said at a press conference in the press center of the 27th CPSU Congress today.

If that meeting helps to develop the Geneva accords and to turn them into practical political agreements on major military and other international problems, we are ready for it at any time when proper conditions are provided.

In short, we stand for a constructive meeting, Leonid Zamyatin stressed. This is our position.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD PHILIPPINES CONSIDERED

Policy Hinges on Bases

LD272043 Moscow TASS in English 1831 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Manila, February 27 TASS -- Corazon Aquino, president of the Philippines, said today that she would honour the treaty on the strategic U.S. military bases in Clark Field and Subic Bay which expires in 1991. After that I reserve for myself complete freedom of choice, she pointed out.

During the recent electoral campaign the problem of the Pentagon's bases was among the central ones. Against the background of the anti-American feelings in the country which are intensifying from one day to another C. Aquino promised in her electoral statements that if she took over, she would solve this problem in accordance with the "will of the people".

Political observers believe that Philip Habib, special representative of the U.S. President, who has just arrived here is planning to meet with leaders of the new Philippine Administration and clerical circles. During his talks in Manila much attention will be devoted to the future of the U.S. military bases.

As though in accordance with a single plan, along with the arrival of Habib in Manila U.S. law-makers started a debate on the Capitol Hill about the amount of U.S. "assistance".

Thus, Richard Lugar, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said that the U.S. should get a better idea of the policy pursued by C. Aquino and only after that discuss the amount of U.S. "assistance".

When putting the rendering of financial assistance in direct dependence on the future of the U.S. bases, Washington policy-makers obviously take into account that the Philippine economy is living through a period of an acute crisis. According to the newspaper L'HUMANITE, the country's foreign debt exceeds 25 billion dollars, which has made Manila one of the world's biggest debtors. At present 40 per cent of the able-bodied population of the Philippines are jobless.

Tokyo, February 27 TASS -- The U.S. and Japan are going to further interfere in the internal affairs of the Philippines and to take advantage of the economic difficulties of that country for bringing pressure to bear on its leaders. According to the newspaper NIHON KEIZAI, urgent American-Japanese consultations will be held in the coming days in Washington. The sides will discuss the situation on the Philippines after the coming to power of the Aquino government. The consultations will be devoted mostly to the problem of rendering to Manila the so-called "strategic assistance" which should guarantee the preservation by the Pentagon of the two military bases, the biggest in Asia. At the coming consultations which, in view of the latest developments, will start a month earlier than it was planned, the sides will also draw up measures aimed at "preventing the danger of the Philippines' sliding to the left".

Aid Plan Under Review

OW271851 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 27 Feb 86

[From the "World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] Here is a report from Manila: Corazon Aquino, the new Philippine president has ordered the release of the first group of political detaineees within the framework of the announced amnesty. The head of state announced that she will respect the agreement on U.S. military bases at Clark Field and Subic Bay. The agreement will expire in 1991. After that, Aquino said: I will keep my options open.

It has to be said that during the electoral campaign, which took place in an atmosphere of growing anti-U.S. sentiment, Aquino promised to decide on the future of U.S. bases in accordance with the will of the people by way of a referendum. It is not yet known whether or not and when such a referendum will be held.

Meanwhile, Washington is trying to thoroughly examine the policy of the new Philippine president and only then will it decide on the issue of the size of so-called U.S. aid to the Philippines.

'Unceremonious' Interference

OW271305 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 26 Feb 86

[From the "World Today" porgram presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] Unceremonious U.S. interference in the internal affairs of other countries, the Philippines in particular, is an expression of so-called neoglobalistic policy.

Former President Marcos, after giving up his duties as head of state, arrived at the U.S. air base of Guam Island in the Pacific aboard a U.S. transport aircraft, together with his family and entourage. U.S. Secretary of State Shultz announced the United States' recognition of the new Philippine Government led by opposition leader Corazon Aquino. You see her on the left of the screen as she takes the oath as president of the country. [video shows Shultz speaking and C. Aquino at ceremony]

President Reagan has again sent his personal representative, Habib, to the Philippines as he said, to verify the transfer of power to the new government.

Meanwhile, additional units of the U.S. Navy, units of Marines, and instructors in carrying out punitive operations against civilian populations have been moved to the shores of the Philippine archipelago, where are located some of the largest U.S. bases abroad.

EX-PRESIDENT CARTER CRITICIZES SDI PROGRAM

PM271622 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 8

[TASS report: "J. Carter: Deceptive Illusion"]

[Text] San Francisco, 26 Feb -- Former U.S. President J. Carter has addressed the Council for International Affairs here and criticized the Reagan administration's SDI plans.

The arguments about the creation [sozdaniye] of a "defense shield," Carter declared, are a deceptive and exceptionally costly illusion. If this program is implemented, it will not make the United States secure. Research into the technical possibilities for the creation [sozdaniye] of an ABM defense was carried out during the Ford presidency and during my own presidency, Carter said. And this was done in full conformity with the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems. This research confirmed the futility of such a project. As for the work envisaged by the "star wars" program, it would be in direct violation of the ABM treaty and would give rise to an arms race in space. Moreover, Carter said, the creation [sozdaniye] of such a system would considerably increase the risk of a military clash with the USSR. The recent tragic incident involving the Challenger shuttle clearly proved that complex space systems cannot be guaranteed against unforeseen faults and accidents.

I traveled extensively abroad during the last month, Carter went on, and I can say that statesmen and public figures in many states evaluate positively Moscow's proposals. The Soviet Union, he pointed out, is prepared right now to eliminate medium-range missiles in Europe. This is an important and positive step. But the incumbent U.S. Administration is responding to it negatively.

DELAY IN SHUTTLE LAUNCHES 'IRRITATES' PENTAGON

LD272340 Moscow TASS in English 1500 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 27 TASS -- By TASS correspondent I. Borisenko:

Large chunks of the main propulsion units of the space shuttle Challenger have been lifted from the Atlantic Ocean floor, Richard Truly, a new official in charge of the shuttle flight programme, has disclosed to newsmen. Until recently, he headed the space command of the U.S. Navy. The chunks are now being investigated by experts.

The delay in the shuttle launch schedule apparently irritates the Pentagon which assigns the reusable space craft an important role in the implementation of the "star wars" programme aimed at deploying strike arms systems in outer space.

Edward Aldridge, undersecretary for the Air Force, speaking during hearings at a subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Technology, said that the U.S. Defence Department will persistently press for the allocation of funds to build a new reusable craft.

He pointed out that at least 4-6 shuttle flights will be annually reserved for military space programmes. William Graham, the acting NASA administrator, bluntly declared that if he had a choice, he would start the assembly of a new shuttle right away.

New York, February 27 TASS -- The implementation of the "star wars" plans questions the White House's readiness to abide by the 1972 anti-ballistic missile defence treaty between the USSR and the United States, writes Charles Maynes, editor-in-chief of the prestigious journal FOREIGN AFFAIRS. In his opinion, if the U.S. President does not change his stance on "star wars", the responsibility for a new chapter in the history of the arms race will rest with the administration.

USSR, DRA EXCHANGE MESSAGES ON TREATY ANNIVERSARY

LD271343 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1228 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, 27 Feb (TASS) - The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers have sent a congratulatory telegram to the DRA leaders in connection with the 65th anniversary of the Soviet-Afghan Friendship Treaty signed on 28 February 1921. It says that this treaty, drafted with the direct participation of Lenin, laid firm foundations for goodneighborliness and cooperation between the Soviet and Afghan peoples. The years that have passed since then convincingly opened up enormous possibilities, as mapped out in the treaty. It continues to be a realible political aad legal basis for the development of all-around links between the USSR and the DRA.

The lofty aims and principles of the 1921 treaty, the telegram notes, received further development in the Friendship, Goodneighborliness and Cooperation Treaty of 5 December 1978, which embodied the will of both peoples to progress unswervingly along the path of strengthening and deepening relations and of consistently defending the ideals of the cause of peace in the new conditions following the victory of the April Revolution.

Soviet people, the telegram stresses, rejoice at the successes of revolutionary Afghanistan, which is implementing a program of progressive transformation. They call for an end to the undeclared war against Afghanistan, unleashed by the forces of international imperialism and reaction, and voice full support for the efforts of the DRA Government to achieve a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan.

A telegram from the PDPA Central Committee, the Revolutionary Council Presidium, and the DRA Council of Ministers to the Soviet leaders notes that after the April Revolution, ties between the two countries -- strengthened by the Friendship, Goodneighborliness and Cooperation Treaty of 5 December 1978 -- have become still more varied, firm, stable, and richer in content. They have grown into relations of brotherhood and revolutionary solidarity, which are especially important in the present complex international atmosphere.

The PDPA, the government, and working people of revolutionary Afghanistan, the telegram says, express their profound gratitude to the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government, and to the Soviet people for the broad assistance in developing various areas of the economy, the social sphere, culture and education, and also for the timely internationalist aid to Afghanistan in its struggle against outside interference by regional reaction and international imperialism, headed by the United States.

PAKISTANI PASHTUNS FORMING DEFENSE COMMITTEES

LD251139 Moscow TASS in English 1111 GMT 25 Feb 86

[Text] Kabul, February 25 TASS -- "Defence committees" are being formed in all areas inhabited by Pashtoon tribes at the call of the National Democratic Party (the main Pashtoon party of Pakistan). As is reported by the BAKHTAR News Agency, leader of the National Democratic Party Wali Khan has called upon all the Pashtoons, including students and pupils, to join the committees and to give a rebuff, arms in hand, to encroachments of the authorities on traditional rights and liberties of the tribes.

While fighting against the aggression of the Ziaul Haq regime in the zone of free tribes, the Pashtoons are hitting strikes on Afghan counterrevolutionary formations, which entrenched themselves on that territory. A few days ago an Afridi tribe unit fully cleared the Dirai Akhur area of counterrevolutionaries, destroying there a counterrevolutionary camp and inflicting considerable losses upon counterrevolutionaries.

SOVIET PROFESSOR DISCUSSES USSR-IRAN RELATIONS

NC271801 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1800 GMT 26 Feb 86

[Interview with Professor Bondarevskiy, Soviet specialist in Oriental studies, by Radio Moscow correspondent Svetlana (Fedorova); date and place not given -- read by announcer]

[Text] [Fedorova] Professor Bondarevskiy, you have given detailed answers to past questions from our audience on the history of Soviet-Iranian relations and on their current state. On behalf of Radio Moscow's listeners, I would like to ask: On which international issues do the views of the Soviet Union and Iran agree or approximate one another?

[Bondarevskiy] First, I would like to refer to the Palestinian question and the need to fight Zionist aggression. We have a good deal in common on this. Both the Soviet Union and Iran demand that the Arab Palestinians be given an opportunity to form a national and sovereign government, the existence of which was foreseen by the 1947 UN decision. We ask that the Zionists withdraw from the occupied territories, and we believe that the U.S. imperialists are backing the Zionists and the Israeli rulers. The Soviet Union and Iran have strongly condemned acts of aggression against Lebanon by the Zionists and the U.S. imperialists.

I would like to point out that the draft CPSU Program, which is currently under discussion in the Soviet Union -- as mentioned in a statement by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev at the fourth meeting of the 11th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet -- refers to the Soviet Union's diligent support for the Nonaligned Movement. We must point out that Iran is a member of this organization. Iran has taken a stand similar to that of the Soviet Union on transforming the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace.

Iran and the Soviet Union are in general agreement on the question of disarmament. There is no doubt that the Iranian people oppose the threat of a nuclear war and the spread of the arms race into space.

[Fedorova] On what issues do the two countries differ?

[Bondarevskiy] We disagree with Iran about ways to normalize the situation around Afghanistan. We are also at odds over the Iran-Iraq war. The Soviet Union favors an immediate end to this war and a solution of conflicts through peaceful means at the negotiating table. However, as you know, Iran's leaders (?are hampering) an unconditional cease-fire.

[Fedorova] In light of the fact that certain circles in Iran are exploiting the presence of the limited number of Soviet military units in Afghanistan, please address the incidents there in detail.

[Bondarevskiy] The reason behind the USSR's limited military presence in Afghanistan, which came at the Afghan Government's request, is clear to everyone. I would like to draw our listeners' attention to one point. The existence of an independent and nonaligned Afghanistan has always been of great interest to the Soviet Government. The first agreement on the basis of equal rights between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan was signed in Moscow 2 days after the Soviet-Iranian agreement, that is, on 28 February 1921. Soviet diplomacy tried in various ways to (?promote) the establishment of equal relations founded on the principle of good-neighborliness between Iran and Afghanistan. We know that in 1921 Soviet Russia had a hand in the signing of the first Iranian-Afghan agreement in Tehran.

When a crisis arose in 1929 in the wake of British plots, and let to the overthrow of Amanullah Khan and the assumption of power by British agent Bacha-i Saqqo, English diplomacy tried to pressure Reza Shah into sending his forces to Afghanistan. It was through the efforts of Soviet diplomacy that this act of aggression was prevented. We have always rejected the idea of tension in Afghan-Iranian relations. When German agents in Afghanistan tried to exacerbate conflicts between Iran and Afghanistan in World War II, Soviet foreign policy categorically opposed them.

The following question arises: Who is interested in the presence of Soviet forces in Afghanistan? The Soviet Union? No, we are not interested in this. In their messages to the United Nations, the Nonaligned Movement, and the Islamic Conference Organization, the Soviet and Afghan Governments have repeatedly raised the question of ending foreign intervention in Afghan affairs. We have asked that the delivery of up-to-date weapons to the Afghan insurgents be stopped and that the infiltration of counterrevolutionary bands into Afghanistan through its eastern and western borders be prevented. Once this is done, the problem of a Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan will be easily solved. The Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, has stated that this is our fervent wish and we will do our best to achieve it. As far as we know, the Afghan Government has adopted the same position.

Dear listeners, as you are aware, talks on Afghanistan are being held in Geneva. However, they have not produced any results. Who is preventing an agreement? Pakistan, primarily. Why? Because the United States is applying pressure and, on the pretext of assisting the Afghan people, Pakistan is arming insurgents and trying to aggravate the tension around Afghanistan. Leaders of a number of Western countries have made several attempts to turn Afghanistan into a springboard for interference in Soviet affairs. Between 1913 and 1932, British agents used Afghan territory as staging ground for subversion and to provide support to basmachi bands which also operated under the banner of Islam in Soviet Central Asia. During World War II, the Hitlerites wanted to do the same thing. We know that in 1978-1979, a plan was prepared in the United States for the deployment of Pershing-2 missiles in the Hindu Kush mountains. Had this been brought to fruition, the aggressors would have been able to place Soviet Central Asia under their control. Of course, we could not allow this to happen.

I would also like to draw our dear listeners' attention to the following point: The CIA is using a number of Afghan refugees living in Khorasan to interfere in Iran's domestic affairs. The CIA hires refugees to carry out acts of subversion against Iran. Therefore, the sooner imperialist pressure on the DRA ends, the better it will be for Iran, for Soviet-Iranian relations, and for world peace.

PHILIPPINE POLICE ARREST 10 CONSPIRATORS

LD280048 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] New York, February 27 TASS -- Philippine police arrested 10 men on the suspicion of conspiring to assassinate the new president of the country, Corazon Aquino, and defence minister Juan Ponce Enrile, UPI reports. The suspects were arrested in the grounds of the Defence Ministry on Wednesday and rifles and submachine guns were discovered in cars parked next to the defence minister's helicopter.

ENVOY TO THAILAND INTERVIEWED ON BILATERAL ISSUES

BK200119 Bangkok BANGKOK POST in English 20 Feb 86 pp 4, 5

[Interview with Soviet Ambassador to Thailand Valentin Petrovich Kasatkin by BANGKOK POST correspondents Saranya Bamrungphong and Wira Prathipchaikun -- date and place not given]

[Text] [Question] Has the scholarship issue [involving Soviet scholarships to Thai students] been resolved?

[Kasatkin] From my point of view, there was not any problem about the scholarships granted by the Soviet Government to Thailand because in all the previous years the procedure was very simple. We just formally inform the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about the decision of the Soviet Government.

The increase of scholarships was done at the direct request of the Thai authorities. This matter was discussed in 1983 when the deputy minister of higher education of my country, Mr Savinsky, made a visit to Thailand. He discussed the question of the quality of diplomas and during his stay he received a direct request from the Thai officials to increase the number of scholarships and so it was done.

We always inform the Thai authorities about the number of scholarships granted and the specifications which are necessary. The special fields which could be chosen and all the choices of what to study in the Soviet Union are always left to the Thais. We understand that every country has its own priority. Some need more doctors, others more engineers. So we think that this is completely the prerogative of the recipient country to decide which experts, in which fields they need most of all. This is our general rule.

This year we are ready ... I have informed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that the Soviet Union is ready to grant 63 scholarships. The choice of subjects for studying is up to the Thais and we now channel this through the appropriate Thai official authorities. But I wish to tell you we are having such difficulties because of the young Thais coming to the embassy. They ask us about the possibilities and we explain to them that according to the rules established here they have to address themselves to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs first. But we don't conceal the number of scholarships granted because it would be improper for me not to inform about the decision of my government. It does not mean that we insist; it is a friendly gesture on the part of my country towards Thailand.

If I am correct, today there are 95 or 96 Thai students studying in my country. We have in the USSR around 100 universities where foreign students are studying. We don't make any difference between foreign students (and Soviet students). We just decide on a very simple and practical basis where the opportunity exists. Second thing that is also very important is that we don't have special higher educational institutions just for foreigners.

They study together with the Soviet students. This is normal procedure. It seems to me that this kind of procedure exists in the other countries as well.

[Question] What about the proposed Thai-Soviet friendship association which has been rejected by the Thai Government?

[Kasatkin] Very frankly, I don't understand perfectly well the reasons for not accepting this kind of friendship society. This is exactly the field of direct contact between the representatives of two peoples...which certainly will help the creation of better understanding in general and influence other fields of our relations in other spheres.

[Question] What about the rejection last year of the Soviet trade exhibition?

[Kasatkin] There was no rejection. This is wrong understanding because this year, on October 16, the industry and trade exhibition of the USSR will be open at the Hyatt Central Plaza Hotel and will continue until November 2. And what is interesting is that it will be accompanied by a vast cultural programme.

I am deeply convinced that this trade and industry exhibition, which will take place in Thailand for the first time, will greatly contribute to the better understanding not only in the general terms but also in the specific terms because it will give a unique chance to the Thai people, the Thai businessmen, to see what are the possibilities of enlarging our relations and exploring the benefits of the bilateral trade and economic cultivation. I hope, well, I am almost sure, that it will be mutually beneficial and I wish to tell you that we have the full support on the part of the Thai Ministry of Foreign Affairs and other official authorities of this country in organising this trade and industry exhibition.

[Question] What do you think about a Thai-Soviet Chamber of Commerce?

[Kasatkin] You know one can answer differently to this question because there are different approaches. One approach is that we should create such an office, a joint chamber of commerce, when relations are (already) highly developed. Yes, this is legitimate, but there is also another approach that is no less legitimate and that is in order to contribute to such development as trade and economic cooperation. It depends upon the mentality and the practical approaches. In my understanding, both approaches are equally legitimate and valid.

[Question] On the Kampuchean problem...

[Kasatkin] The present situation in the world is quite a complicated one. And so to tie the bilateral to certain international programme and make the condition of the development of one programme for the development of the bilateral relations seems to me not quite correct. As I mentioned before, we don't have any big problems that divide Thailand and the Soviet Union. And I am confident that the development between Thailand and the Soviet Union could go independently and could benefit Thailand not less than the Soviet Union.

As to the Kampuchean settlement, the position of the Soviet Union is very simple. This should be settled through the development of the political dialogue. I am personally deeply convinced despite the fact that this is the official policy of my government -- that this is the only way to tackle this question. I can agree with you that this is probably not an easy question today. But it is not one that can't be solved, but to go about it one should have in mind certain things.

First of all, and it seems to me I have talked about it already with the press, this is the account of the present realities that exist. It is the strict observance of the principle of non-interference into internal affairs and the strict accounting of the legitimate entries of the other side.

[Question] Can you elaborate on the political dialogue?

[Kasatkin] Well, what I have specifically in mind you certainly know. The last meeting of the Indochinese states... It seems to me these are quite serious proposals contained in that communique. That deserves the serious attention. Take for example, in the communique the ministers of foreign affairs of the three Indochinese states said that the government of Heng Samrin was ready for a dialogue with the Kampuchean factions -- which are not present right now in Kampuchea, except, of course, Pol Pot. I hope you know the reasons why Pol Pot and his colleagues are not acceptable.

It is a good sign which needs, as far as I understand it, only support from every side. The Socialist Republic of Vietnam has openly said that it is interested and ready for a practical dialogue to make relations with its neighbours as well as can be. They specifically mentioned that they were ready for (specific) consultations, negotiations and dialogue with Thailand and China. This is another example. I think that these kinds of development are encouraging and they can contribute positive results.

[Question] There is doubt about the Soviets' sincerity here and particularly with the presence of hundreds of thousands of Russian-supplied landmines planted on the Thai-Kampuchean border.

[Kasatkin] I don't interpret it in this light because this is not a question directly related to the bilateral relations between Thailand and the Soviet Union. And this is important to understand. Yes, of course, the USSR has relations with other countries. The USSR certainly has certain obligations before other countries as well, but the USSR never conditions the development of its relations with other countries by the development of relations with a third country and this is the case with Thailand.

[Question] Is there a good possibility that a ballet troupe will perform here during His Majesty the King's 60 birthday anniversary next year?

[Kasatkin] We are working on that right now. This is a very positive reply, but I would like to mention that this is not an easy task because I remember perfectly well that almost a year ago, at the beginning of 1983 [year as published], a famous ballet troupe was to come here and the trouble was that there were no sponsors despite the fact that the troupe was supposed to come to Thailand on a charity basis, i.e., they were not supposed to get the money from their performances here.

Now the job of realising this direct request is not easy because the people in my country still remember that unfortunate incident last year. But still I would like to be optimistic and I can promise through you to the Thai public that the Embassy will try and do its best to organise it.

[Question] On trade relations...

[Kasatkin] You know that in a week's time we shall have the biggest event in any country. This is the 27th Party Congress of my country. There will be discussions and decisions made on the social and economic development of my country and the development of external economic relations with foreign countries as well.

And certainly the decisions made at this party congress, which normally convenes every five years, will influence the trade and economic relations between my country and Thailand.

I would like to tell you that, to certain extent, the development of trade and economic relations between the two countries might be qualified as satisfactory. Fifteen years ago the governments of the two countries signed an agreement about the development of trade relations on the basis of equality and mutual benefits. So 15 years have elapsed since that time and I would like to give you a few figures that might be of interest. At that time the volume of trade (two-way) was US$3.8 million. It is now approaching $100 million, which is about more than 20 times. So the effect -- the positive effect -- of this trade and economic agreement signed 15 years ago is vivid. Sometimes I hear that it is not a big volume. Yes, it is not a big volume. It is less than one per cent of the trade turnover of my country. The figures are probably not significant for Thailand as well. But I would like to give you a few more figures which will show you that this is not correct because arithmetic sometimes is not the best criterion for qualification of relations. In 1985, the Soviet Union was the third largest importer of Thai tapioca flour; No. 4 importer of Thai tapioca hard pellet; and No. 5 importer of Thai rice.

I wish to put forward through you a proposal for the business sector concerning a very big deal in trade between our two countries. I suggest a discussion on the supply of Thai textile and knitwear. It could also be sports shoes, sports wear and garments. But this is important. We have a permanent trade deficit in our trade with Thailand. For the last eight years, the trade deficit of the USSR was more than $1 billion. I wish to be very frank and sincere. We don't have free currency at the moment and we are ready to buy these textile goods from Thailand if Thai businessmen are ready to buy Soviet goods. I have in mind first of all, of course, machinery and equipment. But the other goods could be discussed as well and, of course, we won't sell what we don't need for ourselves. No. The legitimate trade and economic interests of Thailand are going to be observed.

Sometimes, I hear and read in your paper that the Soviet machinery and equipment are not that good compared to those from other countries. May I disagree with you. The Soviet Union exports some $11 billion worth of machinery and equipment abroad and such countries like the United States, Japan, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and France are buying. I don't think that these countries, highly developed industrial countries, would buy something which are not as good.

About spare parts and experts problems -- experts can't come to Thailand at first notice because the visa problem is not yet settled. Problems, yes, but they are not insurmountable.

Textile, garments and knitwear. This could be a big deal, indeed a big one. I don't want to even mention the specific figures. Everything depends on the Thai businessmen. This could be done as a kind of counter-trade deal or barter deal. We are ready for this kind of deal in big volumes... Quite often I read that the USSR makes propagandas, that the USSR is in practice not ready for serious discussions on trade and economic deals. Now I propose this specific deal of big volumes -- not only for Thailand, even in terms of the USSR as well.

[Question] What about the cultural treaty proposed by the Soviet Union?

[Kasatkin] We have presented our draft project of cultural and other exchange agreements. No decision is made, not on our part, because of our draft agreement and so our idea is quite clear and the intentions are quite clear.

Well, we understand this kind of question could be tackled on a one-project basis or on a complex basis. I wish to mention here that for my country the complex approach is easier because we have a planned economy and this is why all the events, including the cultural exchanges, are organised on at least a two-year basis. If we have this kind of agreement signed between our countries, it will make it much easier for us because then you will know well in advace what is planned and what is supposed to be realised. It makes cultural exchanges much more difficult an exercise when you take it on the basis ofone project. But I don't complain.

[Question] Finally, would you like to comment on the Thai-Soviet relations?

[Kasatkin] Well, recently I have had various opportunities to quality the Soviet-Thai relations as being good and friendly. Specifically in this respect, Foreign Minister Sitthi Sabetsila has also mentioned that there are no principla questions and problems that divide our two countries and I fully support this statement by the minister of foreign affairs. Certainly, it does not mean that all the potentials which exist in our bilateral relations have been fully explored until now. As ambassador of the Soviet nion I see many other directions, many other fields and spheres, that could be used to the benefit of ourtwo countries.

Naturally, as ambassador I put in thefirst place the political relations between our two countries. Last year manifested quite a good development of these relations. In the political field, you certainly remember that we have had many consultations between the ministries of foreign affairs. There was quite a number of important exchanges of delegations. Specifically, I wish to stress the visit of the delegation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to Thailand and the very oopen and deep discussions that were held with the president of Parliament Dr Ukrit Mongkhonnawin and his colleagues. When I mention in the first place the political relations, I do it intentionally and not because we give the biggest priorities to this kind of relations but for the simple reason that the development of this can facilitate the development of our bilateral realtions in other spheres. Take, for example, trade and economic relations or culture and sports exchanges. It is very important to have a combination, a good combination, of these relations because within this framework a vast range of programmes can be covered. The lack of progress ine one field, of course, influences the progress in other fields. This is the main approach of the Soviet Embassy here. We were told in the past and were taught by the president that without a better understanding of each other it's very difficult to develop fruitful mutually beneficial relations.

This is the main idea which is the cornerstone, I would say, of any bilaterial relations. We have a very good tradition of friendly relations between our two countries with many centrues-old stories about our ties. Take, for example, the first visit abroad of King Rama V to my country at the end of last century. Or even the emotional side of the relations when one of the sones of King Rama V married a Russian girl. And, of course, from the establishment of close relations between our two countries at the end of last century and the beginning of this century, my country was always on the side of Thailand in all its foreign policy problems and relations with the third countries.

I remeber perfectly well the situation when one of my predecessors, the first Ambassador to Thialnd, Olarovsky, took a very active part on the side of the Thai Foreign Ministry in its negotiations with other countries to defend the interest of Thailand. This is very significant. You know, the important factor is that among the people in my country there is a deep feeling of respect for that Thai people. This is why when I talk about the development of relations in different fields, improving relations on the level of contact between the representatives of the two peoples is also very important. And, by the way, Olarovsky was the first president of the Royal Bangkok Sports Club.

JARUZELSKI DISCUSSES 'SOLIDARITY,' FOREIGN DEBT

LD272336 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Excerpts] The Polish leader, Wojciech Jaruzelski, has addressed a news conference held at the Press Center of the 27th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in Moscow.

He went on to say that the opinion was once circulated in the West that there could be no national concord in Poland since 9 million people were members of the Solidarity trade union. But millions of these people, the Polish leader pointed out, still live and work in Poland. Many former members of Solidarity are now deputies to the national parliament and senior officials. Two-thirds of the former Solidarity members have joined the present-day Polish trade unions. So, Wojciech Jaruzelski went on to say, there is no Solidarity problem as a problem associated with the masses of people. There is a problem of a narrow group of people who assume the right to speak on behalf of the masses, but they are generals without an army.

As for the Patriotic Movement for National Revival it unites in its ranks 153 political and public organizations of Poland; that is 20 million people or practically the entire adult population of the country, the Polish leader added.

Many questions put by journalists also dealt with problems of Poland's external debt and her relations with the United States. Answering them the Polish leader emphasized that the United States had neither political nor moral right to punish Poland just because she decides her domestic problems herself. Owing to the American sanctions the economic damage done to Poland amounts to $15 billion and accounts for over half of the country's external debt.

JARUZELSKI PRESENTS STATE DECORATION TO GROMYKO

LD272154 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2030 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Comrade Jaruzelski, PZPR Central Committee first secretary and PPR State Council chairman today presented a high state decoration of his country -- the Grand Cross of the Order of Polonia Restituta -- to Comrade Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman.

Comrade Gromyko has been honored with this award for his outstanding contribution to the cause of consolidating the unity of the socialist community countries and to formulating the policy of detente, peace, and security.

MURAKHOVSKIY RECEIVES PPR AGRICULTURE MINISTER

PM271651 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Feb 86 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] On 24 February V.S. Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Agroindustrial Committee, received S. Zeiba, Polish minister of agriculture, forestry, and food industries. There was an examination of a number of questions regarding cooperation in the sphere of agriculture and the food sectors of industry. W. Natorf, Polish ambassador to the USSR, took part in the conversation.

ANTONOV TRIALS PROCEEDINGS MOVE INTO FINAL STAGE

LD280045 Moscow TASS in English 1846 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Rome, February 27 TASS -- TASS correspondents Yevgeniy Babenko and Aleksey Golyayev report:

Exactly nine months after its first session, the attempted pope murder trial in Rome has at last reached today the final stage and proved that all charges of involvement of Sergey Antonov and two other Bulgarian citizens in that crime has been totally unfounded.

At the session today, prosecuting attorney Antonio Marini, who has been reading his speech for the prosecution of enormous length in the course of the eleven latest sessions, has admitted that there is no "sufficient evidence" to bring any charges against socialist Bulgaria's citizens.

He has thus actually confirmed that all the slanderous "testimony" by Turkish terrorist Ali Agca, who is guilty of an attempt to assassinate the pope, on the strength of which Sergei Antonov found himself in Italian prison, are foul slanders and inventions prompted to Agca by the Western secret services, above all the U.S. CIA with the obvious aim of trying to discredit People's Bulgaria and the other socialist countries. At the same time the prosecuting attorney demanded that the other defendants in the trial in Rome -- members of the "Grey Wolves" terrorist pro-fascist organisation be sentenced to various terms in prison, up to imprisonment for life, and also to pay big fines.

In his concluding speech at the trial, Antonio Marini nevertheless repeatedly attempted to convince the jury that the Bulgarian citizens were involved in the attempt on the life of the pope and urged them to "think hard" before passing the final verdict. It must be recalled that from the very start of that artificially protracted trial, prosecuting attorney Marini has been, as a matter of fact, one of the most zealous architects of the "Bulgarian connection".

As Italian and foreign lawyers attending the trial point out, Antonio Marini's speech for the prosecution was aimed only at trying to deny the firm and obvious alibi of the Bulgarian defendants. In so doing, the prosecuting attorney failed to produce at least a single weighty fact to prove the involvement of the Bulgarian citizens in the attempt on the life of the pope. Instead he built all his charges against them only on "testimony" by Agca, whom he himself repeatedly described as an out-and-out liar.

At the same time, Antonio Marini simply disregarded testimony by witnesses which contradicted his "version". Thus, for example, the prosecuting attorney has actually passed over in silence the statement by members of the "Grey Wolves" organisation, who are under arrest in the FRG, that West German secret services were trying to bribe them for giving false evidence to prove some "Bulgarian connection".

Antonio Marini declined in the same tendentious way evidence by Pandico, a notorious Italian "Mafiosi", who told the court how Agca had been coached in prison by representatives of the Italian secret service.

Having failed to achieve his aim, which clearly was to discredit the socialist countries, Antonio Marini... found nothing better than accusing the judges themselves of a failure to do their duty to the end. he insisted on holding an "additional" investigation, examination of witnesses of minor importance, trying, as before, to protract the trial. The court has declined these demands.

Commenting on the speech by the prosecuting attorney, Guiseppe Consolo, the counsel for the defence of Sergei Antonov, a prominent Italian lawyer, said in a TASS interview:

"The demands put forward by Marini are not astonishing -- this is his job. We could foresee that he was going to demand precisely that. Yet we will not be satisfied with the acquittal of Antonov, Vasilev and Ayvazov "for lack of evidence". In my speech I will prove that my defendant is innocent and is in no way involved in the heinous crime perpetrated in St. Peter's Square in the Vatican".

Speeches by representatives for the defence will take several days, after which the court is to pass its verdict.

SWEDISH PAPER REVIEWS KOMISSAROV BALTIC ARTICLE

PM271946 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 20 Feb 86 p 17

[Stefan Lundberg disptach: "The Soviet Union Rejects Norwegian Conditions for a Nuclear-Free Zone"]

[Text] Helsinki -- The Soviet Union will not accept Norwegian demands for limitations on the numbers of nuclear and conventional weapons on the Kola Peninsula, which are a precondition for a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area. On the other hand, the Soviet Union is prepared to hold talks about a nuclear-free Baltic.

So writes a Soviet under the pseudonym Yuriy Komissarov in an article in the northern Finnish newspaper, KALEVA, yesterday. "Komissarov" is thought to be the pseudonym of high-ranking Soviet official Yuriy Deryabin of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Scandinavian Department.

Observers in Finland also think that other high-ranking people in the Soviet Union's foreign affairs administration could be behind the pseudonym that presents the Soviet view of Nordic affairs in Finnish newspapers at regular intervals.

Komissarov points out in this article that Soviet nuclear weapons on the Kola Peninsula do not threaten the Nordic area's security. He believes that it was wrong for Norway in the so-called Colding report (the report which the Norwegian Government had its Helsinki ambassador prepare immediately prior to the meeting of Nordic parliamentarians on the zone in Copenhagen last year) to make special demands of the Soviet Union because some of its territory borders on a possible future nuclear-free zone.

Komissarov criticizes the nonsocialist Norwegian Government for being led by the nose by NATO. On the other hand, he describes Sweden's and Finland's approach to the zone issue as realistic. In Komissarov's view there have even been fairly tangible changes in the Swedish attitude since Olof Palme's Social Democratic government took office in 1982.

Komissarov is especially critical of the Norwegian view that the zone issue should be resolved in a general European context -- that is, that the zone issue should be linked to the results of the European disarmament negotiations. This simply delays the implementation of a zone for an indefinite period, Komissarov writes.

However, he notes with gratitude Finnish Foreign Minister Paavo Vayrynen's and Olof Palme's statements that the Nordic area should not be passive and dependent on other measures in Europe.

In the article Komissarov also dismisses assertions that the Soviet Union would only be prepared to discuss nuclear-free status for the Baltic in a broader European context. He says that a nuclear-free Baltic cannot be brought about simply by snapping one's fingers, but that a whole series of special questions exist. For example, in connection with the drawing of demarcation lines in the Baltic. However, these are questions which Komissarov considers can be settled at the negotiating table.

Even though Komissarov is thus saying "no" to reductions in the numbers of Soviet arms on the Kola peninsula, he mentions the Soviet Union's readiness to discuss "significant measures affecting the Soviet Union's own territory bordering on the planned zone." However, Komissarov does not specify what he means by these measures. According to Komissarov, these measures should be seen in a confidence- and security-building context.

According to Komissarov, a nuclear-free Baltic would strengthen peace and stabilize conditions in the whole of northern Europe. He says that he understands the Nordic argument about the importance of removing nuclear arms from the surrounding sea areas in light of the recent visits to Swedish and Danish territorial waters by nuclear-armed U.S. warships.

MORE U.S. CRUISE MISSILES COMING TO UK BASE

LD280805 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] London, February 27 TASS -- Ignoring strong public protests, the Conservative government does not intend to abandon plans to deploy a new batch of U.S. first strike cruise missiles in Britain. According to PRESS ASSOCIATION news agency, the Tory cabinet plans to appropriate close to three million pounds sterling for setting up an additional security and guard belt around the military base at Molesworth. Intensive preparations are under way now at this military base, which in recent months has repeatedly been the scene of mass protest demonstrations by the public against the Tory's militarist course, to accept a new batch of 64 missiles. PRESS ASSOCIATION news agency said that the government spent over two million sterling over a year only on guarding this facility.

PRAVDA REPORTS ON DISTURBANCES IN CAIRO

PM271554 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Feb 86 Second Edition p 8

[Own correspondent V. Peresada, TASS reports under general heading "Disturbances in Cairo"]

[Text] Cairo, 26 Feb -- Unrest broke out yesterday at a camp of the internal security forces situated in the Cairo suburb of al-Jizah. According to the newspaper AL-AHRAM, it was caused by "rumors" about a 1-year extension of service in this category of forces.

The rebellious soldiers left their barracks, captured nearby homes and stores, set hotels on fire, and destroyed dozens of motor vehicles. Special police units and army subunits were dispatched to the camp area, and they used their weapons.

The situation still remains complex today. Areas of al-Jizah districts are cordoned off by troops. Jeeps with machine guns at the ready have been stationed near all strategic points in Cairo, including ministries and the radio and television buildings. The airspace above the city is being patrolled by helicopters. A round-the-clock curfew was imposed in the capital and in the neighboring provinces of al-Jizah and al-Qalyubiyah as of 1600 local time. Movement within greater Cairo is allowed only to medical services workers, the fire services, police and military servicemen, and media employees.

Cairo, 26 Feb -- Egypt's President H. Mubarak made a statement in connection with the disturbances within the security forces.

H. Mubarak announced that unrest has taken place in the provinces of Cairo, al-Jizah, al-Qalyubiyah, Asyut, Suhaj, and Ismailia. He confirmed that three large hotel, a large quantity of means of transportation, and grain silos at Asyut and Suhaj have been burned down, and that Turrah Prison has been captured and its inmates set free.

In response to the criminal actions, the president said, restrictions on movement have been imposed in the provinces of Cairo, al-Qalyubiyah, and al-Jizah, while special forces have been ordered to take in hand the situation in areas covered by the disturbances. A large number of initiators of the disturbances have been arrested. The prosecutor's office is conducting investigations. The president noted that no foreign subjects have been harmed.

London, 26 Feb -- REUTER reportes from Cairo that 15 persons have been killed and over 300 injured during the disturbances that broke out in the Egyptian capital. An official spokesman of the Ministry of Internal Affairs declared that there have been numerous arrests. According to REUTER, government troops, including tanks, were used to put down the disturbances.

IZVESTIYA CITES KING HUSAYN ON MIDEAST SITUATION

PM101201 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Feb 86 Morning Edition pp 4, 5

[Special correspondent K. Geyvandov report: "Jordan-86: Fates That Are Interlinked"]

[Text] Amman, Moscow -- Amman, the capital of Jordan, lies sprawling over hills. There were seven of them at one time.

But the city is expanding with every passing year, and having taken over two more hills, as I was told, is now advancing toward a third one. I have had occasion to visit the Jordanian capital more than once in the past 10 years. And as an eyewitness I can say that it is not just growing bigger but also more beautiful.

One thing has not changed, however: Wherever you go in Amman, you are bound to see... a refugee camp. In these camps (there are nine of them in the country) live -- if you can call it that -- Palestinians who were driven out of their native lands way back, after the first Arab-Israeli war of 1948. And after every new war the population of the camps, as well as their number, increased.

Add to this the fact that the Israeli-occupied West Bank was under Jordanian sovereignty until 1967 and that Palestinians make up 50 percent of the Jordanian population itself, and you will have no difficulty in seeing how closely intertwined the fates of the two Arab peoples -- the Jordanians and the Palestinians -- are here. Visiting Jordan as part of a delegation of the USSR Union of Journalists, I shared this observation with T. Kan'an, minister of occupied territories' affairs. He agreed with me, and explained:

"And there is another important factor. In the plans for the further expansion of the state of Israel, as elaborated by the ideologists of Zionism, the East Bank of the River Jordan also features as an 'integral part' of Israel. This is another reason why Jordan is extremely interested in the speediest settlement of the Near East crisis, and the resolution of the Palestinian problem above all."

The Jordanians' concern is understandable. According to the French lawyer Marie-France (Shmidlen), who recently visited the occupied territories, the Israelis have transformed them into "a corner of South Africa where, in addition, an occupation regime on the lines of that of the notorious General Massu is in force." Moreover, the young Palestinians who live in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip are a generation which, despite the fact that they were born after 1967, are by no means willing to reconcile themselves to the occupation of their country. As the Palestinian resistance grows, so, proportionately, grows the stream of abuse and threats from Tel Aviv against the Arab states, accusing them of fostering "terrorism." And these threats, as the experience of Lebanon and Tunisia shows, end with Israeli aircraft bombing peaceful Arab cities and population areas.

The policy of the Israeli Government toward Jordan, which is implemented with the assistance of the U.S. Administration, is furthermore in the nature of blatant blackmail. Blackmail, which pursues the aim of involving Jordan in so-called "direct talks" with Israel and foisting on its terms of a Near East settlement and a solution of the Palestinian question that have been drawn up by Washington and Tel Aviv. In order to achieve this, any means of applying systematic pressure are considered suitable. On the one hand, they are promising that if the outcome is favorable for the "strategic allies" -- the United States and Israel -- the question of granting U.S. military aid to Jordan totaling $1.8 billion will be dealt with positively. On the other hand, they are threatening that if the talks fail, the Arabs will lose such an "amenable" partner as S. Peres, the current Israeli prime minister, who will have to hand over in the fall to the Likud's Y. Shamir.

What is Jordan's stance in this, frankly, extremely complex situation? I sought the answer to this question from everyone I talked to while I was in Jordan, and primarily, of course, during my interview with King Husayn of Jordan.

"Our stance on a Near East settlement," King Husayn replied, "is based on a number of firm principles that stipulate the withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied Arab territories including the Arab sector of Jerusalem, the recognition of the legitimate rights of Palestinian people of self-determination, and a comprehensive solution of the Palestinian problem. We favor a comprehensive solution of the Palestinian problem. We favor a comprehensive settlement of the Near East crisis that would be fair to everyone and we oppose separate deals and partial solutions. We are therefore confident that all this could be achieved within the framework of a UN-sponsored conference attended by all interested parties including the PLO and the permanent members of the UN Security Council."

King Husayn agreed with me that for the just cause of the Arabs to be successful, the unity of action of their leaders must be ensured, and that at least two pan-Arab, [obshchenatsionalnyy] goals, namely the liberation of the Israeli-occupied Arab territories and the restoration of the flouted rights of the Arab people of Palestine, could serve as a good platform for this. He stated that it was in this context that the steps taken by Jordan lately to overcome differences and to develop cooperation with Syria, and also its attempts at mediation in the cause of the normalization of relations between other Arab states, had to be viewed.

Reportedly, the current round of the Jordanian-Palestinian consultations which opened in Amman in January during my visit there is to mark an important milestone in the mobilization of pan-Arab [obshchearabskiy] efforts. As I was told in circles close to the Palestinian delegation, these consultations pursue the aim of stepping up the process of negotiations on a Near East settlement by focusing attention on the various aspects of an international peace conference as the main instrument of achieving peace and security in the Near East.

During my most recent visit to Jordan I heard many statements expressing a high opinion of the Soviet stance on questions pertaining to a Near East settlement and leveling objective criticism at the U.S. Administration. The Americans are being mistakenly, stupidly, and dangerously egoistic in rejecting the proposed peace conference, (Dzh.) Hawatmah, editor of the JORDAN TIMES, said, for instance, because they refuse to recognize the fact -- and it is a fact -- that unless the Soviet Union and all interested Arab countries take part in the peace process, success cannot be achieved.

My old acquaintance M. al-Sharif, chief editor of the newspaper AL-DUSTUR, told me about his speech to U.S. congressmen at a dinner given in their honor by the Council for International Problems in Amman recently. In particular, he called on Washington "to stop daydreaming and to face up to the realities of the Near East," which comprise the following: First, the PLO is the partner with whom it will have to do business in any talks; second, no matter what pressure is brought to bear on Jordan, it will not conclude a separate deal with Israel; third, the Soviet Union cannot be excluded from the process of a Near East settlement because it is physically present in the region and has strategic interests there.

Assessing positively both the principles of a Near East settlement and the ways of achieving it, as advocated by the Soviet Union, my interlocutors invariably emphasized with satisfaction that the Soviet proposals pay detailed attention to questions of the organization of the work of a peace conference, including the establishment of working groups both on a general basis -- including all the conference participants -- and on a bilateral basis. They noted in particular the significance of the proposal to hold plenary sessions to discuss the results of the work of working groups (commissions) and, as necessary, also on other occasions, at which, on the basis of a consensus of all the conference participants, the accords reached could be approved.

This is now in conversation with me M. al-Khatib, minister of culture and information, summed up in a few words the importance for Arab countries of the convocation of an international peace conference on the Near East and the Soviet Union's participation in it:

"Whenever Israel considers the possibility of talks with the Arabs, it invariably proceeds from the premise that it will have the United States at its side as its counsel. We Arabs, therefore, must also have our counsel, and at the proposed peace conference it will be the Soviet Union."

It is pleasing to note that in international matters the Jordanians by no means confine their interests to the problems of a Near East settlement. During my meetings with leaders of the press syndicate who were our hospitable hosts and with the editors of leading newspapers and representatives of the Jordanian public, many other questions of international politics were raised and a high opinion was expressed of the Soviet peace initiatives and in particular the 15 January statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

"One would like to hope," T. Masarwah, chief editor of the newspaper SAWT AL-SAH'B, for instance, said in conversation with me, "that, first, the U.S. side will respond positively to the Soviet proposal to eliminate nuclear weapons throughout the world by the year 2000, and, second, that the implementation of this program will create favorable conditions for the elimination of regional conflicts, including the Near East conflict..."

At the beginning of my article I wrote about how closely intertwined the fates of the Palestinian and the Jordanian peoples are. As for the Palestinians, after each trip to Jordan (or Lebanon, or Syria) I keep seeing in my mind, as in a documentary film, a long line of children's, women's, and old people's faces, the faces of the inhabitants of the Palestinian refugee camps whose eyes contain a constant mute reproach appealing to the conscience of a mankind that has still not redeemed its incalculable debt to this nation of refugees.

COMMENTATOR ON KUWAIT NATIONAL DAY, TIES WITH USSR

LD262200 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1530 GMT 26 Feb 86

[Viktor Yuriyev commentary]

[Text] The Kuwait people celebrate their national day on 25 February. It is special this year. The Arab emirate in the Gulf gained its independence 25 years ago, in the summer of 1961. Our commentator Viktor Yuryev wrote in this respect saying:

A quarter of a century is not a long period by historical standards; however, the Kuwaiti people have been able to do much during this period to consolidate their political and economic independence. As a result of the nationalization of foreign oil companies that used to operate in the country, Kuwait extended its total control over the extraction of oil and natural gas. Kuwait directed the increasing revenues from oil to implement the large program to develop and diversify the national economy. Tangible results were achieved in this direction and much has been achieved in the social field as well.

Kuwait, today, is a country where the rate of education of the population is one of the highest in the Middle East, and the most dangerous transmissible diseases have been completely eliminated.

At the international level, the Kuwaiti leadership's positive policy of neutrality and its invitation to strengthen peace and security, have gained Kuwait respect throughout the world.

Kuwaiti diplomacy's primary efforts always have been directed toward solving the Middle East problem. The Kuwaitis [words indistinct] vis-a-vis this problem have a relentless standpoint in which there is no (?leniency), and they see that peace in the Middle East can only be achieved if the Israeli aggressor withdraws from the occupied Arab territories and the Palestinian people's legitimate rights including their right to establish an independent state, are secured.

Such a standpoint is in complete agreement with what the Soviet Union has been fighting for for many years. This was pointed at several times in the documents [word indistinct] that were taken during the Soviet-Kuwaiti meetings and discussions on the various [words indistinct], with the consolidation of its presence in the Arab Gulf, and the imposition of the U.S. trusteeship on that region's countries.

The Kuwaiti leadership always declares that Gulf security is a matter concerning the states of that region itself and cannot be secured by means of foreign armed intervention. Such a standpoint receives total understanding and support from the Soviet Union. Kuwait and the Soviet Union did and continue to express their profound anxiety as a result of the continuous armed conflict between Iran and Iraq. [Passage indistinct]

Kuwait-Soviet relations, established in March 1963, have been developing successfully for more than 20 years. And they have been built since their establishment on the basis of the principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of each side and respect of each side's sovereignty, equality, and mutual benefit. During the recent visit to the Soviet Union by Kuwaiti leaders, including Defense Minister Salim al-Sabah in 1984, and Oil and Industry Minister Ali al-Khalifah al-Sabah last month, both countries expressed their mutual endeavor to [promote] the extensive program of cooperation between the two countries. The Soviet Union, on Kuwait National Day, expresses confidence that the two countries' firm cooperation [words indistinct] in the political, economic, and financial spheres [words indistinct] and security in the Arabian Gulf region and the Middle East.

SOVIET-TUNISIAN COOPERATION BODY SIGNS PROTOCOL

PM271606 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 8

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] Tunis, 26 Feb -- A protocol on the results of the first session of the Soviet-Tunisian Intergovernmental Standing Commission on Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation and Trade has been signed here. In the document the sides noted with satisfaction the successful development of cooperation in various spheres, including industry, trade, science, and health care.

During the session particular attention was devoted to the prospects for further expanding bilateral business links, developing cooperation in the sphere of science and technology, and exchanging scientific and technical information as well as scientists and specialists.

The Soviet delegation was received by Tunisian Prime Minister M. Mzali.

IZVESTIYA NOTES CHAD DEVELOPMENTS, CHIDES HABRE

PM271617 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 8

[TASS reports under the general heading: "Chad: To the Roar of French Aircraft. The Puppet Thanks his Patrons"]

[Text] New York, 26 Feb -- Patently at the instigation of Washington and Paris, Habre, head of the Ndjamena regime, has spurned the possibility of national reconciliation in Chad under OAU auspices.

At a press conference in the Chadian capital he claimed that the OAU is "incapable" of achieving a settlement in his country. Habre tried to demonstrate that it is "wrong" to regard the conflict as an internal problem and, consequently, to speak of national reconciliation.

It is clear from Habre's speech that his regime sees U.S. and French armed interference as the only means for a "settlement." He did not stint his praise for the French Government, which has sent troops and combat aircraft to Chad, and also for the Washington administration, which is urgently transferring weapons to Ndjamena. Habre asked the United States for new military deliveries. Citing Western sources in the Chadian capital, AP reports that the White House might very soon submit a proposal to Congress for the further expansion of aid to Habre.

Sabotaging a peaceful settlement of the problem at the hands of the Chadians themselves, the head of the Ndjamena regime repeated the hackneyed fabrications of Western propaganda about some kind of "interference by Tripoli" and the "activation of Libyan war preparations" in the north of Chad. AP points out not without irony that, while making that statement, Habre "sometimes had to almost shout, since his voice was being drowned out by the roar of French military aircraft at a nearby airfield."

Paris, 26 Feb -- AFP reports that the Chadian Transitional Government of National Unity has issued a statement urging the OAU to make every effort to settle the Chadian conflict, which is of an exclusively internal nature.

In Dakar, AFP points out, A. Diouf, chairman of the OAU and president of Senegal, confirmed the pan-Africa organization's intention to continue the mediatory mission entrusted to President D. Sassou-Nguesso of the Congo.

The Chadian problems must be resolved within the OAU framework and without external interference, states a message from President I. Babangida of Nigeria to M. al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution. It was delivered to Tripoli by Nigerian Foreign Minister (B. Akinyemi), who is making a tour of a number of countries with a view to organizing a peace conference on Chad.

Offensive Planned

LD271446 Moscow TASS in English 1326 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Paris, February 27 TASS -- The Ndjamena regime, backed by the United States and France, is about to launch an offensive on the positions of the forces of Chad's Transitional National Unity Government, a serviceman from Hissein Habre's army has disclosed in an interview with a correspondent of the Paris newspaper LIBERATION. "We are leaving for the front to capture Faya Largeau," he said.

According to French press reports, the chief city in northern Chad is viewed in Ndjamena as a top-priority target of the planned assault by Habre regime units.

Commenting on Habre's news conference in Ndjamena, LE MONDE draws attention to his flat refusal to give a reply to the question about the size and character of French aid to his regime. Saying that this is a "military secret", he added that it is "so far early to talk" about the results of Operation Epervier (Hawk). Habre's remarks, it is noted here, confirm the existence of the Paris plans to set up a permament military base in that country, to be fitted with modern offensive weapons.

According to French journalists accredited to Ndjamena, both Washington and Paris are providing crash training courses for the Habre troops. LE FIGARO, in a report from a military college near Ndjamena, states that the training of commanding officers has been started there under about one hundred French instructors. Even the march songs of the Chadian trainees have been borrowed from French paratroopers and are sung in French. Several groups of servicemen are studying in the United States, including at West Point Military Academy.

'Interference' Condemned

LD271602 Moscow TASS in English 1521 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Tripoli, February 27 TASS -- The Transitional Governemt of National Unity [GUNT] of Chad is prepared to take part in the implementation of any initiative directed at settling the situation in the country under the auspices of the Organisation of African Unity. This was stated in Bardai, a town in Northern Chad, by the minister of information of the transitional government Ibrahim Mal. He firmly condemned the American and French interference in Chadian affairs under the lying pretext of Libyan "involvement" in the conflict. The transitional government, the minister said, cautions all forces outside of Africa against interference in Chad which would lead only to an undermining of the prospect of national reconciliation and a further aggravation of the crisis.

HONDURAS TO INVESTIGATE U.S. CHEMICAL SPRAYING

LD262133 Moscow TASS in English 2010 GMT 26 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 26 TASS -- The National Assembly of Honduras has taken the decision to form a special commission to investigate into facts of chemical substances sprayed from an American warplane over a number of northern areas of the country, the UPI news agency reports from Tegucigalpa.

The decision was taken when complaints started coming in from residents of the Villanueva settlement who stated that an American plane sprayed over the settlement a yellow chemical agent and then irritation and boils appeared on their skin. By many indications, that substances is reminiscent of the Agent Orange toxin which was used by the United States during the war in Vietnam.

The news agency points out that the Honduran authorities have sent a group of doctors to the area of the Villanueva settlement.

NICARAGUANS DEMONSTRATE RESOLVE AGAINST U.S.

LD272351 Moscow TASS in English 1315 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Managua, February 27 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Alexander Trushin.

The celebration of the sixth anniversary of the foundation of the Sandinist People's Militia, held in the city of Masaya, has turned into a demonstration of the Nicaraguan people's resolve to defend the revolution against encroachments on the part of American imperialism.

Humberto Ortega, member of the national leadership of the Sandinist National Liberation Front, defence minister of Nicaragua, addressing the rally said that the Republic's people are prepared to repulse any counter-revolutionary adventure by the U.S. Administration, including direct armed invasion. The multi-million aid package which President Reagan intends to give the CIA's hired gangs will not help him break the Nicaraguans' striving for freedom and independence, Ortega said.

The Nicaraguan Government favours a peaceful, equitable dialogue with the United States with a view to settling the outstanding problems, the minister observed. At the same time, in the conditions when Washington rejects the proposals for talks and the peace initiatives of the Contadora Group, betting on the escalation of aggression, Nicaragua will continue to strengthen its defences.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON SITUATION IN HAITI

Mass Demonstrations Reported

PM271600 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Feb 86 Second Edition p 8

[TASS report under general heading "Around Haiti"]

[Text] Havana, 26 Feb -- According to reports arriving here from Port-au-Prince, popular demonstrations have broken out with renewed force here.

Mass demonstrations have taken place in the Haitian capital's streets. Their participants are demanding the establishment of real democracy in the country and protesting against the rule by the "National Government Council" which, in line with U.S. instructions, includes some of "Baby Doc's" former associates.

Under pressure from the people's masses, the "National Government Council" has decided to change Haiti's national flag. It is well known that back in the past the Duvalier clan proclaimed the black and red flag to be the "national" flag, despite protests by the people. Henceforth the red and blue flag beneath which Haiti's people fought for the motherland's independence back in the late 18th and early 19th century is again the country's national flag.

At the same time, foreign news agencies note that the new authorities have still not done anything to alleviate the people's difficult situation. Hunger still reigns in Haiti, as before.

'Tense Situation' Continues

LD272355 Moscow TASS in English 1305 GMT 27 Feb 86

[Text] Havana, February 27 TASS -- Tense situation persists in Haiti, according to reports from Port-au-Prince. Many cities of the country are the scene of on-going demonstrations. The participants demand that the National Governing Council effect fundamental democratic transformations and harshly punish all those who are held responsible for murders during the Duvalier tyranny. Making attempts to bring down the pitch of the popular actions, the authorities announced an extension of the curfew.

According to a statement by a Haitian radio station, Tontons Macoutes, members of the secret police of the former dictator, who remained in the country, committed another heinous crime by poisoning drinking water in the city of Port-de-Paix. Twenty people fell victim of the action. It has also become known that police used firearms in dispersing a march in a suburb of the capital, whose participants protested against the rule of the pro-American national governing council.

Demanding an immediate punishment for the ringleaders of the Tontons Macoutes, the marchers besieged Port-au-Prince's international airport, in whose building the hated butchers holed up. This protest sparked high alarm of the authorities who actually continue patronizing the former secret police of Duvalier.

Washington, February 27 TASS -- The U.S. State Department stated that the new Haitian government's "most radical break with the Duvalier past has come in the areas of human rights and democracy". This statement by the State Department, which has no real foundation whatsoever, allows U.S. lawmakers to give 25.5 million dollars in "economic aid" to Haiti's new authorities.

Initially this sum was meant for the Duvalier regime. But, when it became clear that the days of tyranny are counted and that "Baby Doc" totally compromised himself in the eyes of the world public by bloody terror, the White House tried to dissociate itself from its puppet and refused to grant these funds to the dictatorship. Political observers point out that in appropriating money for the new authorities of Haiti, Washington does not conceal that the National Governing Council enjoys its all-round support.